McGhee
784

Sultan Mehmed II, the Conquerer
Ex Libris
George Crews Mc Ghee
United States Ambassador
to Turkey

Ali Pacha.

LATE VIZIER OF JANNINA.

THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

IN ITS RELATIONS WITH

CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

BY

RICHARD ROBERT MADDEN,

Fel. R.C.S. Eng., M.R.I.A., &c.

Author of "Travels in Turkey, Egypt, Syria, and Palestine," "Egypt and Mahommed Ali," "The Mussulman," "Life and Martyrdom of Savonarola," "Infirmities of Genius," "Memoirs of the Countess of Blessington," &c.

London:

T. CAUTLEY NEWBY,

PUBLISHER, 30, WELBECK STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE.

1862.

CONTENTS OF CHAPTERS OF VOL. I.

CHAPTER.		PAGE.
I.	Introductory Notice of the Nature and Influences of Turkish Institutions	1
II.	Summary Notice of the Career of Mohammed, A.D. 571—632	24
III.	The Koran—Extracts from it, Illustrative of its Principles and Teachings	58
IV.	The Caliphate and Saracen Race	116
V.	The Tartar Race—Turcoman Tribes—Seljukian Turks—Origin of the Ottoman Empire	205
VI.	Othman, the Founder of the Ottoman Empire, and his Immediate Ancestors, 1288—1326	239
VII.	Orchan, Second Sultan of the Turks, 1326—1359	248
VIII.	Sultan Amurath I., Third Ottoman Sovereign, 1359—1389	256
IX.	Sultan Bajazet, Fourth Sovereign of the Ottoman Empire, 1389—1402	268
X.	The Doom and Destiny of the Christian Rayahs of the Turkish Empire, and Consequences of the Capture of Constantinople, 1453	290
XI.	Functionaries connected with the Religion of the State in Turkey	306
XII.	The Institution of the Dervishes	319
XIII.	The Institution of the Janissaries, 1330—1826	334
XIV.	Sultan Selim III., and his Reforms, 1789—1807	353
XV.	Sultan Mustapha IV., 1807—1808—Sultan Mahmoud II., 1808—1839	370
XVI.	Sultan Mahmoud II.—The Wahabis	379
XVII.	Sultan Mahmoud II.—Egypt and Mohammed Ali, 1805—1849	389
XVIII.	Sultan Mahmoud II. and his Reforms—The Janissary Institution Reformed altogether—Death of the Sultan	421
XIX.	Sultan Abdul Medjid—His Reforms and their Results, 1839—1861	442
XX.	The Causes and Results of the late War with Russia, 1853—1855	474
XXI.	Statistics and Finances of the Turkish Empire	515

DEDICATION.

To

His Friend,

DR. WILLIAM BEATTIE,

this Work, which treats extensively

of

Matters affecting Christianity and Civilization,

is fitly and affectionately

inscribed by

THE AUTHOR.

1st Dec., 1861.

THE TURKISH EMPIRE,

IN ITS RELATIONS WITH CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

CHAPTER I.

Introductory Notice of the nature and influences of Turkish institutions.

I ENTER on this work with an extensive knowledge of the subject, the result not only of much research, but a residence of upwards of four years in the Turkish Empire. It has been my fortune to have visited the Levant, and witnessed events of great importance to the interest of the Ottoman Empire, at three periods, widely separated—the first in 1824, the second in 1840, the third in 1860, so that I have had opportunities afforded me for comparing the opinions I formed in early life, concerning the Ottoman Empire and its destiny, with those which now (advanced in years) I retain, or have adopted.

The experience thus gained and the permanent interest excited, in a subject with which I had become so very intimately and early acquainted, have familiarised me with the study of the most important of all questions connected with Ottoman history —the influence of Turkish rule and of Mahommedanism over Christianity and civilization.

It appears to me, that this influence has received too little attention of late years at the hands of travellers in the East, or statesmen and politicians at home, who have dealt with Oriental affairs; and that the people of the British Empire

have been greatly deceived by the recent apologists of Turkish rule, as well as by the eulogists of Turkish institutions.

Our old English travellers of a century and a half and two centuries ago—our Sandys, Maundrells, Knollys, &c., did not lose sight of the question above referred to, nor deem its just consideration of small importance to the true interests of humanity, involved, as they believed them to be, in those of Christianity and civilization.

When the actual state and future prospects of Turkey are dealt with in the works of modern travellers, it would really seem as if the bearing of those questions on the political or commercial interests of their several nations, was their primary, and very often their sole consideration.

It might be imagined by one intimately acquainted with Pera embassies and consulates, with the influence and mind-contracting tendencies of diplomatic politics, and the unwholesome atmosphere that surrounds them, that all the inspirations of modern travellers were derived from the agents of foreign powers at the Porte. It would seem that to one a particular mission had been assigned to write up the political influence of his government, and to another the task of running down that influence, and to another the duty of promoting the commercial interests of his nation in the Empire of the Ottomans over those of every other country, and to regard the interest of Turkey and its subjects, its Christian slaves, and the relations of that Empire with Christianity and Civilization, as matters of comparatively small importance.

A great many religions have sprung up in the course of the last eighteen centuries, antagonistic to Christianity. But none of them have been so triumphantly and permanently hostile to the Christian religion, as the faith of Islam; and, strange to say, in a ratio with the violent outrages committed against Christianity, have been the tendencies to vindicate and advocate the character of the impostor Mahommed, and his imposture the Koran.

What is truly marvellous in these tendencies is, that

Christians, believing in their religion, read eulogiums on the character of Mahommed, apologies for, and even panegyrics on the Koran, without ever suspecting that the authors of these works are practical infidels professing Christianity, whose real objects are indirectly to disparage Christianity, and directly to accredit its impugners.

Thinking men in England, Scotland, and Germany, who believe in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, have for many years been perplexed and bewildered by their experience of the state of public opinion, especially of people in the upper and middle classes, in respect to those doctrines. They perceive that a vast amount of high intellectuality and social respectability had become utterly indifferent in matters of religion, and a very large proportion of those who were highly intellectual and respectable (but more candid, or less cautious, than their fellow-thinkers at an earlier period) were not only indifferent in matters of religion, but had ceased to believe in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and had become rancorous in their animosity against those who believed implicitly in Christ and in Christianity. Still those perplexed and bewildered persons found some comfort and consolation in the reflection that, generally speaking, every gentleman in England was expected to be a Christian. They were disposed, too, to hope for a better state of things, by the external manifestations of respect for Christianity which conventional notions of literary propriety had led to the adoption of, in the public prints.

But the last few years have witnessed a marvellous alteration in the tone of practical infidelity professing Christianity, or from conventional notions of gentility and politeness, abstaining from an expression, pure and simple, of disbelief in the long-established religion of the State, and have furnished abundant evidence of that alteration, not only openly in society, but publicly in the press. Men of a high order of intelligence, several of them men of standing in the universities, have made a remarkable advance in philosophy; they have cast off the

caution and timidity of unbelief at an earlier period of this century, and they present themselves boldly before the world as "men of advanced opinions," "leading thinkers of the day," "exponents of the theology of inexorable reason," "believers in a system of expansive philosophical thought," who proclaim the necessity of snapping asunder the links that have bound us to the childish terrors and the credulous hopes of "old theologic faith."

We find in the new philosophy the old cautious policy of practical infidelity professing Christianity, discrediting the Gospel by espousing some antagonistic scheme, such as that of Mahommedanism, for instance, or revived Buddhism, and setting up the supposed advantages of either, to the same eminence as the benefits of Christianity. They covertly disable those benefits, and they adopt open out-spoken opinions that the time is past and gone, and never to return, for the "old theologic faith, historic Christianity," as an authority to impose restraints on "inexorable reason," or to assume a right of interference in the contests of unfettered speculation on the field of philosophy.

The foreign "advanced thinkers" Strauss and Feverback, and Auguste Comte, and the British exponents of the theology of "inexorable theology," Herbert Spencer, Buckle, Baden Powell, Theodore Parker, G. N. Lewis, Mr. Martineau, Gregg, the Hennells and though last, not least in intellect, Francis Newman, *cum multis aliis*, too many, unfortunately, to be named in this brief notice of "the believers in a system of expansive philosophical thought," in different degrees concur in this grand dogma of the new law of "inexorable reason" and in different forms of expression give utterance to their conviction of its truth.

The gospel has been critically and philosophically examined by these writers, and found wanting in many things that "inexorable reason" requires. The critics and philosophers, the high priests of "inexorable reason" have therefore passed sentence of death on Christianity. They acknowledge its many titles to

respect; its grandeur, simplicity, the loveliness even of its lineaments, now pale, and cold, and calm, and all but lifeless.

> " O she doth teach the torches to burn bright,
> Her beauty hangs upon the cheek of night;
> Like a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear,
> Beauty too rich for use—for earth too dear!"

" This noble outburst of Jewish fanaticism" has left an impression on humanity, the results of which, it is generously admitted, must be beneficial; nevertheless, we of this time, it seems, have done with it: it is a religion of the past. Notwithstanding the vast moral influence it has had, yet " as a systematic whole, it is essentially true, that Christianity has indeed passed away from us, and has left us only an inheritance out of its influences." We are told: " The external part of Christianity thus retires to a far-off place in the course of human events, where it remains an object of deep historical interest, and may even be regarded as exerting influence down to our own age, through the stimulus it gave to intervening occurrences; but with all the interest that is personal to ourselves in the matter of our religion, it seems to have no longer any connection. It has become a thing of the past, buried with the past, for any share we have in it." Referring to a work by Charles Kennell, entitled " Inquiry," a disciple of his says that there was effected by it " an entire breaking up of the framework of miracle built around the life of Jesus."*

The efforts made by writers in our own times, professing to be Christian, to palliate the frauds, and to extenuate the outrages against morality and humanity; against the fundamental doctrines of Christianity in the Koran, and to vindicate the character and mission of Mahommed, at the expense of the religion of which it has been the deadly foe and unrelenting persecutor for upwards of twelve centuries, have not been

* See " Thoughts in Aid of Faith," &c., by Miss S. S. Kennell; and also an essay on " the Sceptical tendency of Bishop Butler's Analogy," by the same author. 1859.

surpassed in any former age; indeed, I do not think they have been equalled.

Whenever Turkey is involved in great difficulties or perils, on the eve of a war or a revolution, the English public crave information in conformity with preconceived ideas formed on the most slender foundation: consequently the subject of Turkey must be written up to the standard of those ideas. Of the English eulogists of Mahommed and Mahommedanism, a very large number are polemical literati, also literary men who have devoted themselves especially to the study of Oriental languages, and statesmen who think the preservation of Turkey is a policy to be pursued for the advantage of one country, and perhaps the frustration of the designs of some other.

One dominant idea pervades the writings of all those I refer to, of whatsoever category of religionists they may be—whether high church or low church, enthusiasts and fanatics, or persons of very unsettled opinions, or loose in their religious principles, or even doubtful of the truth of the fundamental tenets of Christianity—nay, looking on its principally recorded miracles and mysteries as myths and allegories—the idea that Mahommed and Mahommedanism were raised up by God to oppose a barrier to what they deem corrupted Christianity, in their mode of rendering that idea; to stem the torrent of superstition and corruption of Christian doctrine, which we are told flowed from Rome over the Eastern empire and its contiguous regions.

Several of these eulogists, apologists, and partisans of Mahommed and Mahommedanism, men of learning, and talents, and great acquirements, in their writings would really appear to have been rendered incapable of seeing the truth on the subjects they deal with—of discerning the infamy of the Impostor's life, manners, morals, and public as well as private courses; the shocking impiety of his pretensions to familiar intercourse with God; to revelations through the angel Gabriel for the special purpose of composing quarrels with his numerous wives; of sanctioning outrages on them; of legitimatizing acts

of signal iniquity in his household, such as taking away the wife of his slave Zeid, and marrying this married woman; beating refractory wives in general, divorcing them at will, but not suffering them to leave their lords and masters for any amount of wrong, ill usage, or injustice.

The Koran, in terms pure and simple, divided the earth and the people thereof into two portions—one it called Deir-ul-Islam, the House of Islam; the other Deir-ul-Harb, the House of War —and also signified the Herd of Infidels. This compendious division of the world and its people rendered a designation necessary for this state of things between the House of Islam and the Herd of Infidels. The term *Djihad* was invented and made to signify a state of permanent hostility. "A holy war (says Ubicini), legally and necessarily subsists between believers and unbelievers, the *Deir-ul-Islam* and the *Deir-ul-Harb*, and which can never lawfully cease until the last infidel on earth shall have consented, either to pay tribute, or to embrace Islamism. The *Djihad may, however, be suspended, though it can never be wholly abolished by virtue of an Amaun or pardon, and also by the power of treaties.*"

It must be borne in mind these words are M. Ubicini's (published in the 2nd vol. of his standard work on Turkey, in 1854), the ablest advocate of Turkey and its institutions of our times. The foregoing observations may serve for an answer, short, simple and irrefutable, to all the sophistry that has been employed in our press, and a vast deal of other literature that is devoted to the affairs of Turkey, especially since the late war for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire.

The Turkish Empire orginated in the power of the sword, wielded by fanaticism, and when aggrandized and enriched by many conquests, and especially by the overthrow of the Empire of Rome in the East, and the sack of Constantinople, assumed a governmental form, an organised system of fanaticism, which has subsisted on the strength of its old traditions, on the horded treasures that have remained of its old spoils, on the jealousies and divisions of the great Christian powers, and of

late on the protection, especially of the principal protestant state of Europe, accorded to it in the name and on behalf of the interests of civilization, which are involved, it is supposed, in the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe.

The civilization of Europe is thus deemed involved in the preservation of the integrity of the Turkish dominions in Europe, in the maintenance of the Empire, and the faith of which the arch-impostor, the great adversary of Christianity, Mahommed, is the founder. For the maintenance of that Mahommedan power in Europe, and necessarily for the protection of its faith, that great Protestant power and, strange to say, the principal Catholic power of Europe, in alliance with it, within the last seven years have squandered ineffectually, at the very lowest computation, for no permanent advantage to the interests of England or of France, in the late war with Russia, about eighty-five thousand men, and upwards of fifty-six millions sterling. The losses of French and English in the Crimea, as officially acknowledged by both governments, are thus estimated:

French	62,492
British	22,737
Total.....	85,229

The far greater proportion of the above enumerated men and officers perished, as usual in campaigns like that in the Crimea, not by steel, lead, or powder, but by disease, hardship, and privations. We have returns given us of the number of Russians who died in this war, but not of Turks, nor of Sardinians. The Russians admit a loss of two hundred thousand. I think it may be presumed that their loss was not less than three hundred thousand.

The losses of the Turks and Sardinians combined may be estimated at 30,000, making the total sacrifice of life in this war, at the very least, 414,229.*

* At the conclusion of the war, Lord Palmerston, in the House of Commons, March the 31st, 1856, the day after the Treaty of Peace was signed, said:—"Our losses were trifling compared with those inflicted upon the enemy (the Russians),

Von Hammer, in his introduction to his admirable "History of the Ottoman Empire, from its Origin to our Times," a work the result of thirty years' labour, observes :—"The numerous European historians who have written the annals of the Ottoman Empire from Byzantine works, rarely merit the

which, he had good authority for saying, amounted in the aggregate to not less than 560,000 men. He had read in official returns a statement of the losses of British soldiers, made at different periods, by which it appeared that the final and total loss from every cause, of men killed in action, and by deaths from wounds, amounted to 270 officers and 22,467 men." (See Ann. Reg. for 1856. pp. 55—57).

But in a subsequent debate, the 6th of May, 1856, Mr. Milner Gibson said—"We have fought in defence of Turkey at the cost of something like one hundred millions of money, and the sacrifice of some 50,000 men." (See Hansard, vol. 140, p. 86.)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, in his speech on the budget, May the 19th, 1856, said—"The total war expenditure incurred in the Crimean war was estimated at £56,772,132 sterling." (See Hansard, vol. 142, p. 334.)

The probability is that the British loss was under-stated by Lord Palmerston, and the Russian loss exaggerated. The total loss of life in this war did not fall far short of half a million.

From a Return to Parliament, No. 204 of "The total number of officers and men of the Army killed, or who died of wounds or from sickness, in the Crimea, up to the 1st of June, 1856, the following data are taken :—

KILLED.		
Officers	157	
Ditto, non-commissioned	161	
Privates	2,437	
		2,755
DIED OF WOUNDS.		
Officers	86	
Ditto, non-commissioned	85	
Privates	1,848	
		2,019
DIED FROM SICKNESS.		
Officers	147	
Ditto, non-commissioned	574	
Privates	15,320	
		16,041
		20,815
In the preceding return, the loss in the Commissariat and Land Transport Service is not taken into account. If it reached the number of.....		1,922
The total loss, as estimated by Lord Palmerston, would be		22,737

On the 22nd February, 1856, the Chancellor of the Exchequer "compared the expenditure of the last twenty-two and a-half peace months, £30,984,955, with the expenditure of the last twenty-two and a-half war months, £74,549,329; the difference, £43,564,374, forming, as nearly as could be calculated, the precise sum which the war had cost us." In the same debate, Mr. Gladstone remarked that "the debt created within twenty-four months was probably £36,000,000,

trouble of close examination (correction of errors, mistakes of copyists, editors, and translators), and still less the numerous authors, who, at the outbreak of each war with Turkey, inundate Europe with detestable works."

Professor Creasy, when he sat down to write a history of the Turkish empire, founded chiefly on Von Hammer, ought to have borne in mind that the eminent German Oriental Scholar had recourse solely to Turkish and Arabic historical authorities, and to diplomatic documents, chiefly existing in Austrian and Venetian Archives for the materials of his history, and that he utterly repudiated the only Christian writers who could have given the views and facts, recorded by Christian contemporary writers, living on the spot, actors in, or witnesses of, those scenes of which the Byzantine writers have treated.*

The English public are indebted to Lady Easthope for an excellent English translation of the admirable work of M. Ubicini, "Lettres sur la Turquie;" the first volume of which was published in 1853, the second in 1854.

To what antecedents, or relations, or incidents in periodical literature, or connection of proprietors or editors of journals, with exalted personages, the Turkish empire is indebted for a fair defender of its faith and institutions of no ordinary cour-

and many items of charge would fall in, which would show that an addition of fifty per cent. above the £43,000,000 would hardly represent the net cost of the war." (Vide Ann. Reg. for 1856.)

But there are two important elements of calculation not taken into account in the preceding estimates of expenditure and loss to the service. When the Chancellor stated the total expenditure incurred for the Crimean war up to the 19th of May, 1856, was £56,772,132 sterling, the war had only ceased seven weeks previously; consequently, all the expenditure for the maintenance of the army during that time and on its return home, and also for the charter of vessels employed for that service, still to be encountered, may be estimated at £3,500,000. The total expenditure then would be £60,272,132.

But there is another very important item, which affects not only this return, but the estimate of the total loss of men to the service by the Crimean war. In the same official return above referred to (No. 204), we find the following very important entry:—"Invalided at the end of the war—Non-commissioned officers, 1,137; privates, 13,581. Total, 14,718 men." So it will be found Mr. Milner Gibson's estimate was not very much above the mark.

* "Histoire de L'Empire Ottomane Depuis son Origine jusques à nos Jours." Par J. de Hammer. Traduit de l'Allemande, par Monsieur J. J. Helbert. Paris, 8 vo. 1835.

age and talent, it would be needless, perhaps invidious, to enquire.

In Lady Easthope's preface to her translation, the forcible manner is remarkable in which the religion of the Turks, and the character of the founder of it, and the manners, morals, and governmental regime of that people, are defended, stoutly —I had almost said manfully. Modern writers and European travellers, who have published books relating to Turkey, who have spoken disparagingly of its amiable people, and the much injured faith of Mahommed, are handled, of course, not so tenderly as Turks would be who were champions of that faith, and of Turkish institutions; but it is pleasing and consolatory to find that Lady Easthope, in the fullness of her Christian benevolence, "acquits these authors of an intention to mislead, though she must severely blame them for having given currency to such inaccurate statements."

This is kind, condescending, and charitable of Lady Easthope, but unless this opinion of the author is expressed after the manner of the Mussulmans, it will find no acceptance with her ladyship. Then let him pray to Allah, first performing the preliminary ablutions, and proclaiming, "There is no God but one God, and Mahommed is his prophet"—that the shadow of her ladyship's kindness and condescension may never be diminished, and that the borders of her benevolence may be continually enlarged! Lady Easthope, in her preface to the translation of Ubicini's work, says:—

"Another great cause of the mistakes and misrepresentations into which travellers fall, next to their usual ignorance of Oriental languages, is the disregard and contempt they indulge for the religion of the country, arising out of their total ignorance or misapprehension of the nature and spirit of that religion, and of its practical effect on the whole of Mussulman life. No stronger instance can be given of the slight attention hitherto paid, even by thoughtful men, to the real question of the East, than the usual estimation of the character of Mahommed. The religion taught by the prophet deserves not the reproaches that have been cast upon it, nor the horror with which it has been

invested, because we have been content to take for granted, without further investigation, that the Mussulman creed is a compound of sensuality, intolerance, and imposture. But as a recent writer has observed, Christian and Mussulman both worship one God; and however the Mussulman in his pride may, and often does, look down on Christianity as a faith inferior to his own, he bears it no intolerant hatred. He may be indifferent, but he is not systematically hostile; nay, on the contrary, a belief is cherished by many who have arrived at more enlarged philosophic views, that the day is destined to arrive when Islamism and Christianity shall approach, unite, and be blended in one! What, too, was the often repeated saying of the late Sultan Mahmoud, that 'henceforth he wished to know the Christian only in his church, the Jew in his synagogue, and the Mussulman in his mosque?' We do not mean to affirm that there is not still, and will not be for many years to come, a great amount of bigotry and fanaticism existing among the remote and ignorant population, and in certain cities and districts; but we do say, that, just as we Christians are no longer what we were three or four centuries ago—since we no longer burn heretics or witches, or pretend to exorcise evil spirits —so have Mahommedans in the progress of time undergone a change. Many of them are becoming more enlightened, more philosophic, and looking beyond the letter of the Koran seek for its spirit. It is this which has enabled Mahommed and his son Abdul Medjid to accomplish innovations and reforms, without destroying the edifice of the empire, and being themselves buried in the ruins."

"The Turkish empire is as interesting and important at the present day as when, three centuries ago, the power of the Grand Seignior was felt from the gates of Vienna to the frontiers of Barbary. It then aroused the fears—it now fixes the hopes of civilised Europe. We have ceased to dread a barbarous invasion of Moslems, and we seek, on the contrary, to render the Moslem a rampart against the invasion of northern despotism."

The great Florentine politician and historian did not find

everything in Turkish institutions surrounded with the same delightful tints and fragrant odours as did this accomplished lady. Macchiavelli's opinion of the effect of an allusion even to the Mahommedan empire is tersely expressed, "Puzza al naso d'ognuno, questo barbaro dominio."

I am far from believing there is nothing to admire in the Turkish character. There is nothing, indeed, to admire, to advocate, or eulogise in their government, in its policy, in its administration. There is nothing in their religion of good to counterbalance the enormous amount of evil in the precepts it inculcates, teeming with bloody instruction, with incitements to sensuality, to hatred, and abhorrence, and persecution of Christians, to ferocity and fanaticism. But human nature is the same in Turkey as it is elsewhere, an admixture of good and evil; and if we find bigotry and fanaticism prevailing amongst Moslems, let us bear in mind that these evil weeds grow everywhere, and even luxuriantly in our own land.

"We blame Turkish fanaticism (says the Hon. F. Walpole, in his Travels); is there none among ourselves? High churchmen and Evangelical, Roman and Protestant, Greek and Armenian, Nestorian and Maronite—have they toleration? Each, but lend them the match, would fire a pile to consume the rest. To hear the Moslem's cry to God—his burning prayers; to listen to those continued calls, 'To God! to God!' Yes, there is much of good—much, much to be admired in their faith and in their zeal. We vend our Bibles as we vend waste paper. Is the Koran treated thus?"*

It is a curious fact in the history of many nations, semi-civilized, as well as pagan, that when their trust has been shaken in their old faith, and the vital principles of it have ceased to exercise any influence over their conduct and practice, their fanaticism does not soon or suddenly die, but still exists for a long time in a different form. People cling with a desperate tenacity to the name and fame of the founder of their religion,

* The Ansayrii, by Lieut. the Hon. F. Walpole, vol. iii., page 77.

and to the outward forms of it, when its internal life and light are gone.

Sandys, in the dedication of his admirable travels in the East (begun in 1610), thus speaks of the lamentable effects of Mahommedan dominion in lands once Christian:—

"The parts I speak of are the most renowned countries and kingdoms; once the seats of most glorious and triumphant Empires; the theatres of valour and heroical actions; the soils enriched with all earthly felicities; the places where Nature hath produced her wonderful works; where Arts and Sciences have been invented, and perfected; where wisdom, virtue, policie and civility, have been planted, have flourished; and, lastly, where God himself did place His own Common-wealth, gave laws and oracles, inspired His Prophets, sent Angels to converse with men; above all, where the Son of God descended to become man, when he honoured the earth with his beautiful steps, wrought the work of our Redemption, triumphed over death, and ascended into glory. Which countries once so glorious, and famous for their happy estate, are now, through vice and ingratitude, become the most deplorable spectacles of extreme misery; the wild beasts of mankind having broken in upon them, and rooted out all civility, and the pride of a stern and barbarous tyrant, possessing the thrones of ancient and just dominion. Who, aiming only at the height of greatness and sensuality, hath, in track of time, reduced so great and goodly a part of the world to that lamentable distress and servitude, under which (to the astonishment of the understanding beholders) it now faints and groaneth. These rich lands at the present remain waste and overgrown with bushes, receptacles of wild beasts, of thieves and murderers; large territories dispeopled, or thinly inhabited; goodly cities made desolate; sumptuous buildings become ruins, glorious temples either subverted, or prostituted to impiety; true religion discountenanced and oppressed; all nobility extinguished; no light of learning permitted, nor virtue cherished; violence and rapine insulting over all, and leaving no security save to an abject mind, and unlookt on poverty, which

calamities of theirs, so great and deserved, are to the rest of the world as threatening instructions."*

When we want to get solid information respecting Turkey, Syria, or Egypt, sound views of the state of things, social, religious, or political in any portion of the dominions of the grand Seignior, we must go back to our old travellers in the East, and the English writers who have described its people, and vicissitudes in the last century, and the latter part of the preceding one.

Mr. William Eton, for many years resident in Turkey and Russia, published his "Survey of the Turkish Empire" one of the best works on the institutions, commerce, and finances of that Empire, at the close of the last century. This writer's estimate of Turkish government differs not from that of Sandy's.

Mr. Eton thus speaks of the government of Turkey and the probable destiny of that Empire :—

"The question of the probability of that dismemberment or regeneration of Turkey, is effected by two causes of opposite movement in its affairs which have been long in operation. The first of these has been in existence for upwards of four hundred years, feelings of implacable resentment for grievous wrongs, oppression and humiliation, on the part of the subjected Christians of all creeds and races, in the Turkish Empire, attachment to their several religions, by a natural law, strengthened by persecution, and in the case of the Greeks, sentiments of nationality kept alive in their minds smouldering there in every period of their servitude by a domination rendered more intolerable by its insulting insolence, even than by its rapacity. The Turkish law speaking of the Rajahs of the Empire says: 'Their substance is our substance, their eyes are our eyes, their soul is our soul.' The law of nature, speaking in the heart's core of every Rajah, says in tones 'not loud but deep,' the rule of our Turkish masters is our abomination; their religion

* George Sandy's "Relation of a Journey begun A.D., 1610." In Egypt, the Holy Land, &c., 3rd Ed. 4 to. 1627.

is our anathema, their race is our deadly enemy. Herein is to be found a permanent state of evil, the first cause of internal mischief to the Turkish Empire that threatens its dismemberment.

"The second course of danger to it, is of an external nature, the secret influence of a Christian power inimical to the Porte, that of Russia, exercised not only in Turkey over a large portion of its Christian population, but in its diplomatic relations with European courts in the prosecution of its policy, and with the Porte itself, and not only thus embarrassing by secret hostile influence continuously exercised, but also by openly advanced pretexts for war, and occasional action on their measures of internal improvement on the part of the Turkish government, and impeding all its efforts for regeneration."

Reschid Pacha's specific remedy for all diseases of the Turkish empire is amalgamation of all religious sects, Mahommedans, Jews, and Christians, into one happy family of cosmopolitan liberalized Turks, and removal of all religious scruples and prejudices. And strange enough, the machinery of government on which he relies for the accomplishment of these two great and utterly impracticable objects, is a system of national education afforded by the state in mixed schools, to be open to all subjects of the Ottoman Empire; and the amalgamation of all the Christian sects in the Turkish dominions in "one happy family of harmonious rajahs."

Lord Palmerston believes in the regeneration of Turkey—I confess I have no belief in the probability of any such renovation or renewal of vigor or vital power in that Empire. Turkey, so long as she is allowed to subsist by the five Great Powers, and while she owes her existence to the mutual jealousies of England, Russia, France, Austria, and Prussia, will be able to check revolts, more or less tardily as they are distant from the capital; but as to defend her frontiers against invasion, or to push an army into an enemy's country on her frontiers—the thing is impracticable. "This empire—(says Mac Farlane)—which has been a scourge and a curse—with perfect repose, may yet live

on a few years: but so sure as it moves or attempts any violent action it will fall to pieces, like a body taken out of an old coffin, and exposed to the air and motion."

In the various works that issue from the press in relation to Turkey, whenever a crisis occurs in its career—a war with Russia is apprehended or is at hand, a rebellion has broken out in one of its provinces, a massacre of some hundreds or thousands of its Christian subjects has been accomplished—we find the Turkish empire and its crisis, or war panic, or rebellion, or massacre, regarded only from one point of view; and from that point nothing is seen but English, French, or Russian interests in Turkey.

Moreover, if the actual, political and religious institutions of the country, its present power, resources, commerce, or finances are treated of, the origin of those institutions, acquisitions, of all Turkish power and dominion, and of the real nature of the religion on which they are founded, are not dealt with; or, if they are considered, are neither fairly nor fully inquired into.

It is, indeed, a terrible calamity for mankind, that the most powerful nation of the world, the one that could exercise by far the greatest amount of influence in favour of the interests of humanity, in every quarter of the globe, should be disposed to adopt a policy, in its relations with Turkey, that its rulers dare not attempt to justify to themselves, or to the world, unless they were as regardless as Gibbon of the consequences of parading before mankind sentiments of indifference in regard to the interests of Christianity, and feelings enlisted on the side of Mahommedanism. But this would be an inconvenient course for official men of any party to pursue. In England it is expected that every gentleman in a high office should be a Christian. There is a certain degree of respectability about the profession of Christianity which cannot decorously be dispensed with in Downing Street.

The cause of Turkey is, however, espoused, the character of its institutions vindicated, the tolerant spirit of its government

extolled, the injured innocence of its religion in all its relations with the condition of Rayahs strenuously contended for by ministers of state—alas! for Christianity, even by ministers of religion, asserted in parliament and in the press, on the plea that British interests, which are those of civilization, are presumed to be indissolubly connected with those of the Turkish empire. That maxim of our *haute politique* was first propounded in the British parliament by Mr. Pitt, at the time of an apprehended rupture with the Empress Catherine; reduced to an official formula, in which all state wisdom, devoted to our policy in the East, is concentrated, it has been adopted ever since Mr. Pitt's administration, by each successive government, to the great injury of the true interests of England and of civilization, and—if I may be permitted to speak, *with all due humility*, of other considerations with the "less advanced thinkers" of the age—those of Christianity. For the maintenance of Turkey we have made great wars, wasted millions of money, shed a vast deal of blood; and have constantly been in collision with other European powers on account of our supposed interest in Mahommedan dominion in the Levant. Our capitalists, too, have been misled by the representations that have been made in parliament, and the press, of the stability of the Turkish empire, and some twenty millions of English money have been lent to this government whose finances are involved in inevitable ruin.

Our costly efforts to prevent the dismemberment of the Turkish empire may have tended to retard its fall; but, ultimately, assuredly, they must prove fruitless and unavailing.

The world has suffered more calamities from mistaken views of statesmen, regarding public interests, than from any other cause. The interests of the people of England are in no wise served by the maintenance of the Turkish Empire. On the contrary, if that Empire ceased to exist in Europe, Asia Minor, the Holy Land, in Egypt, and the Islands of the Archipelago, England, in a few years, would be marvellously benefited by the liberation of a vast territory of the finest regions in the world from

Turkish tyranny ; regions where now there is hardly any cultivation or population, and, consequently, no field for commerce. About twenty years ago, the Duke of Wellington said it was not sufficient that the commerce of this country should not fall off; it was essential that the commerce of England should increase from year to year, and never cease from augmenting steadily.

The true interest of England, in respect to her relations with foreign countries, and especially in regard to the Turkish Empire, is to create traffic, and surround herself with customers. To do this, her policy must be to favour, by her legitimate influence, circumstances calculated to promote industry, cultivation, material progress and population, with a view to the extension of her commerce, in countries, particularly like Turkey, where vast territories, many of them the most fertile on the face of the earth, and formerly the best cultivated and most prosperous of any regions of the globe, are now, to the extent of millions of acres, lying waste, and unproductive, and thinly populated. On the low ground alone of selfish policy, on the part of a great commercial nation like England, the promotion of her true interests make it most ardently to be desired that such vast territories in Europe and on its borders should cease to be unproductive, that their resources should be developed, that industry should be protected and encouraged, population increased, new wants created, and with them a nation or several nations of new customers for English manufacturers called into existence. In a few distinctly spoken words, is it not a consummation most devoutly to be wished that the brutal Mahommedan despotism of Turkish rule should cease to be a dead-weight of oppression on the fertile soil, and the energies of the Christian races of the vast territories which are included in that portion of the Turkish Empire that are situated in Europe and Asia Minor ?

It is high time for England, if her people are to be held justly entitled to the claim of practical, plain, strong, sound, and round-about common sense—which is universally allowed

to be a national characteristic—to withhold their assent from the policy that has been so long pursued by statesmen of warlike instincts, with such infinite mischief at home and abroad, and at such a terrible sacrifice of life and expenditure of money, for the maintenance of what is called the balance of power in Europe.

This formula is now surrounded, I am aware, with great state sanctions. The very words of it are pronounced, by politicians of eminence and of all parties, with solemnity, and received by the profane vulgar with reverence. I say, it is high time this "Shibboleth" of state-craft should cease to juggle the people of England out of their wits, and to fool them into wars like those which they have allowed themselves to be dragged into, for the maintenance of a brutal despotism that has brought a curse on every soil whereon it has set its foot; and has been a calamity to every Christian people it has subjected to its barbarous rule, and trampled on for all the centuries that its withering dominion has endured.

It is high time, I say, for the people of England to determine that they will no longer suffer their understanding to be imposed on and insulted by the miserable sophistry and unmeaning jargon of the policy which this formula professes to express; to resolve they will not approve and can no longer acquiesce in statements made even by the ablest veteran statesmen of our times—that it is necessary for Great Britain, for the sake of the interests of civilization, to defend and maintain —and in that just and necessary defence and maintenance to fight for—the Turkish Empire.

In 1824, I had occasion to see many exhibitions of the effects of Turkish despotism displayed in the wretched condition of the people, and the desolation of a vast extent of territory, in a journey of mine over land from Smyrna to Constantinople, a distance of about three hundred miles. The weariness of this long route was aggravated by the spectacle of a fine country and a rich soil, generally speaking, uncultivated and unpeopled. For the first time in my life, I travelled whole days without seeing a

peasant, and, indeed, from *Brusa* to *Magnesia*, without viewing as many scattered houses as would form a decent hamlet. Nothing can be more dreary than to traverse a country for which nature has done everything, and man nothing. The desolation I encountered at every step proclaimed the Moslem to be an enemy to national prosperity in particular and to human happiness in general. In short, the traces of despotism were written in legible characters on the soil, and the stamp of degradation was imprinted on the features of the few wretched peasants encountered in my route. It was evident, indeed, that the country through which I passed was "a land of tyrants and a den of slaves."*

One of the most gifted men of his time in France, the eloquent, original, bold, and independent thinker, the Abbé Lacordaire—in a discourse pronounced in 1845, directed one brilliant passage to the consideration of the Turkish Empire: "Let us turn our regards to the Mussulman. His origin is of a later date than ours by six centuries. Mahommed had the gospel within his reach; he could copy it, and in effect he has borrowed from it. Well, what is this Mussulman? What has he been? Under his domination what has become of Greece and Syria? Where is the cultivation of the soil of these regions? Where is the old territorial aspect of these countries, which, with so many other glorious recollections, had been transmitted to us by the memorable traditions of their mountains and their plains. The earth even could not live under the ignoble pressure of a rule which its twelve hundred years of existence has not taught the advantages of production or instigated the protection even of a blade of corn."

An Englishman still more renowned than Lacordaire for intelligence, and academic lore of the higher order, makes the following observations on the same subject:—

"The same selfish sensuality with which the Turks regard the rational creation of God possesses them in their conduct

* Madden's Travels in the East, vol. 1. p. 144.

towards physical nature. They have made the earth their paramour, and are heartless towards her dishonour and her misery. We have lately been reminded of the Doge of Venice making the Adriatic his bride, and claiming her by a ring of espousal; but the Turk does not deign to legitimatize his possession of the land he has violently seized, or to gain a title to it by any sacred tie; caring for no better right than the pirate has to the jurisdiction of the high seas. Let the Turcoman ride up and down Asia Minor or Syria for a thousand years, how is the trampling of his horse-hoofs a possession of those countries more than a Scythian raid or a Tartar gallop across it? The imperial Osmanli sits and smokes long days in his pavilion; and thinks not of his broad domain except to despise, and to plunder, and impoverish its cultivators; and is his title made better thereby than the Turcoman's, to be the heir of Alexander and Seleucus, of the Ptolemies and Massinissa, to be the representative of Constantine and Justinian? What claim does it give him upon Europe, Asia, and Africa, upon Greece, Palestine, and Egypt, that he has frustrated the munificence of nature and demolished the works of man?

"Asia Minor especially, the peninsula which lies between the Black Sea, the Archipelago, and the Mediterranean, was by nature one of the most beautiful, and had been made by art one of the most fertile of countries. It had for generations contained flourishing marts of commerce, and it had been studded with magnificent cities; the ruins of which now stand as a sepulchre of the past."*

I propose, in the present work, to combine more reliable information than is to be found collected, in the same compass, in any other book on Turkey; on the several subjects of the career of Mahommed, A.D. 572—632; his pretended revelations and his religion, as it is laid down in the Koran and the Sonna; the origin of the Saracens and the Caliphate, and vicissitudes of the caliphs, down to the period of the rise and pro-

* Lectures on the History of the Turks, 1854.

gress of the Tartar Turcoman tribes of Seljukian Turks; the conquests and irruptions of the great Tartar hordes of Zinghis Khan, Mahmoud, and Timour; the antecedents of the Turkish emirs, the predecessors of the founder of the Turkish empire in Asia Minor, Thrace, and Annatalia, prior to A.D. 1288; detailed notices of the four first Ottoman sovereigns—Othman, the founder of the Turkish empire, Orchan, Amurakh the First, and Bajazet, from 1288 to 1402; in the interval between the reign of Bajazet and the commencement of that of Selim III. in 1789; less detailed accounts of the intervening sultans, but ample notices of the principal institutions, resources, and population of the Turkish Empire; and notices, *in extenso*, of the reigns of the last four sultans. These subjects will be comprised in the first volume.

The second volume of this work will be devoted to Syria and its different races and religions; detailed accounts of the several Christian churches—the orthodox Greek church, the Armenian and Latin churches, the several Coptic, Syriac, and Chaldean communities in communion with the Roman church. In this volume will be found traced the origin and history of the Druses, Ansarii, Metoualis, and Maronites; the strife and animosity of opposed sects and races in the Syrian provinces, fomented by fanatical factions in Constantinople; dervishes and santons put forward by the ulemas of Stamboul to excite the minds of the Mahommedan people in the provinces against Christians, to commit murders, to make extensive massacres and razias, and to have a holy war proclaimed against Christians, the cross trampled down, and the crescent set up in its stead, and the banner of Christ removed to make way for that of Mahommed.

CHAPTER II.

Summary Notice of the Career of Mahommed, A.D., 571—632.

THE ancestors of the great Arab pseudo-prophet were of the tribe of the Korashites, of Arabia Felix, for whose antiquity and pre-eminence on that account high claims are set up by Arab historians. The immediate ancestors of Mahommed, who were natives of Mecca, were descended, it is said, in a direct line of primo-geniture from Phar-Koraish, the founder of that family. Their pre-eminence was recognised at a period when their prosperity was on the wane. The grandfather of Mahommed enjoyed the honour of keeping the keys of the Caaba, and having the care and custody of that ancient temple (then Pagan) committed to him—the same to which Mahommedans now make their pilgrimage at Mecca, and then as much celebrated for the Sabæan worship of the Arabs. The father of Mohammed dying before the latter was two years old, while his grandfather was living, all the power and wealth of his family passed into the hands of young Mahommed's uncles, especially to Aber Taleb, who was a man of much influence in Mecca.

There was a singular custom in vogue among the old Arabs, not to advance the son, if a minor and incapable of governing, to the headship of a tribe or family, but the uncle, or some one of the latter who had arrived at maturity. Something of the same nature was practised among the ancient Irish, in virtue of that institute of the Brehon law, the law of Tanistry; and it seems the

Arabs used the same method in respect to succession to the headship of tribes, and the presidency of the temple of Mecca, otherwise Mahommed would immediately have succeeded his grandfather both in his fortune and the magistracy.

The founder of Mohammedanism was born in Mecca, A.D. 571, according to the most authentic accounts. In 584, at the age of thirteen, he was sent by his uncle into Syria on a trading expedition,—on his first journey tending his uncle's camels, and on subsequent expeditions trading for him up to the age of twenty-five, when he married Kadigha, the widow of a rich merchant of Mecca, in 596, having previously acted as her factor in some trading expeditions in Syria.

In his thirty-eighth year, A.D. 609, he began to be spiritually affected, to have trances and visions, and previously, there is reason to believe, was subject to epileptic seizures,—as may be inferred from the accounts given of occasional visitations of loss of consciousness, fits of abstraction, deprivation of sense, suspension of the power of motion and faculty of speech.

It was at this period of his life (circa, A.D. 609), that he frequently retired to a cave near Mecca to meditate, fast, and pray, and there it was that he was wont to have those trances and visions which the Arab writers ascribe to a sacred origin, and connect with celestial influences.

"His first entrance (says Abulfeda) into the prophetic office, was by a true night vision." Sale dates his mission from his fortieth year, A.D. 611. Prideaux says he then first declared himself a prophet of God. Some Arab historians say Kadigha was the first disciple of Mahommed; others deny this, and say she at first repudiated his claims to divine inspirations, saying his revelations were delusions of the devil.

Abulfeda says—"Mohammed made his converts in secret for three years from the time he announced himself in his family as a prophet." From A.D. 614, he began to preach, and to announce his mission publicly; and Ali, his son-in-law, volunteered to act as his vizir.

It is quite certain that from his thirty-eighth year he began

to entertain thoughts of devising a new religion, and proposing the adoption of it to his countrymen. His commerce with people of various creeds, and communication with persons of several nations in which religious impostors at that period were rife, and their impostures common subjects of conversation, were calculated to excite the imagination of an enthusiast; to encourage morbid feelings; to turn evil thoughts and tendencies into perverse sentiments of permanent depravity; to tempt him to become an habitual deceiver; to forge, feign, delude, and play the hypocrite, and become in time a maker for himself of a false conscience, a self-deluded being, half knave, half madman—a great criminal and a grand enthusiast, constituted so as to be fit to be a scourge and an instrument of divine retribution for the punishment of mankind. Mohammed deemed it prudent not to rush all at once into religious mysteries and revelations from a disorderly life, the unpleasant passages of which were too well known to his townspeople. He affected solitude, silence, mental abstraction, raptures, eremitical practices, and made a habit of withdrawing at stated times (Prideaux and several of his biographers say daily), from the turmoil and bustle of the world, and spending some hours in the cave named Hira.

And at this time, it is a fact very deserving of attention, though Prideaux, Sale, Ockley, and Von Hammer have passed it over as a matter of small importance, or, indeed, of none at all, that Mohammed was subject to seizures of syncope, which had all the characteristic signs and symptoms of epileptic fits.

During these seizures of syncope we hear of visions and revelations; and Prideaux says it was at night when he returned home from the cave of Hira, that he used to tell his wife, Kadigha, of the visions he had seen and the strange voices he had heard in his retirement. But when he used to feign to her that he actually conversed with the angel Gabriel, she was slow in believing these things, till consulting a fugitive monk that was in the house, he persuaded her that her husband was really called to that prophetic office he pretended to.

Having for two years together constantly practised a retired life, he, in the fortieth year of his age, began to take upon him the style and title of the Apostle of God; but for four years did it only in private, among such as he had most confidence in. His first proselyte was Kadigha, his second, Zaid Ebn Haretha, his slave, and the third his cousin Ali, who used to style himself the first of believers. He tempted Zaid by promising him his freedom, which he gave him accordingly; and hence it has become a law amongst the Mahommedans ever since to make their slaves free whenever they turn to their religion. His fourth disciple was Abu-Beker, who, being one of the richest men of Mecca, and a person of great wisdom and experience, brought with him no small reputation to his cause; and his example was soon followed by five others—Othman Ebn Affan, Zobair Ebno'l Awan, Zaod Ebn Abou Wakkas, Abdarrhaman Ebn Awf, and Abou Obeida Ebno'l Jeroh; who were afterwards the principal commanders of his armies, and the chief instruments by which he established both his empire and imposture in those parts of the world. He began more openly and publicly, in the forty-fourth year of his age, to declare himself a prophet sent by God, to redeem the people from the error of Paganism, and to teach them the true religion. His first doctrine was that there was but one God, and that he only was to be worshipped, and that all idols were to be taken away, and their worship utterly abolished, and that those who said God had sons or daughters, or that there were any other Gods associated with him, were impious, and ought to be abhorred; by which doctrine he struck both at that of the Trinity among the Christians, and the idolatrous practice of the Arabs, who worshipped Allat, Menah, and Al Uzza, female deities, which they held to be the daughters of God, whose idols and temples he afterwards everywhere destroyed.

Mahommed did not pretend to deliver any new religion, but to revive the old one which God gave first unto Adam, and, when lost in the corruption of the old world, restored it again by revelation to Abraham, who taught it to his son Ismael;

and the latter, when he settled first in Arabia, instructed men in the same; but their posterity degenerated into idolatry, which God sent him now to destroy, and restore the religion of Ismael. He acknowledged both the Old and New Testament, and that Moses and Christ were prophets sent from God; but that the Jews and Christians, having corrupted the holy writings, he was sent to purge them from those corruptions, and to restore the law of God to that purity in which it was first delivered, and therefore most of those passages he takes out of the Old and New Testaments are related, otherwise than they are in the original.

Mahommed pretended to receive all his revelations from the angel Gabriel, who was sent from God on purpose to deliver them to him. Being subject to the falling sickness, whenever the fit was upon him, he asserted that it was then the angel came from God with new revelations to him, the splendour of whose appearance, he being not able to bear, threw him into those trances, in which the angel conversed with him, and delivered the messages from God which he was sent to reveal to him. In the year A.D. 621, his celebrated night journey to Heaven was performed by him, which he has mysteriously alluded to in the Koran, and which his historians have amplified considerably.

We are told by Dean Prideaux, from whose life of Mahommed the following details are mainly but not solely taken, that when Mahommed first set up for a prophet, there was not one man in Mecca who could either write or read, save only Waraka, a kinsman of Kadigha's, who had first turned to the Jewish, and afterwards to the Christian religion, and had learnt to write Arabic in Hebrew letters. Hence it was that the men of Mecca were called the illiterate, in opposition to those of Medina, who, being partly Jews, and partly Christians, were both able to write and read, and for that reason were called the people of the book. From them several of Mahommed's followers, after he came to Medina, learnt to read and write, which some of them had begun to do before

of Bashar, the Cendian, who, having sojourned at Anbar, a city of Chaldea, near the Euphrates, there acquired the art; whence going to Mecca, and marrying the sister of Abou-Sophian, he settled there, and from him the men of Mecca are said to have first received the art of letters. Among the followers of Mahommed, Othman was the best proficient therein, which advanced him afterwards to be secretary to the Impostor. They were obliged at first, for want of paper, in a place where there had never been occasion for it before, to make use of the blade-bones of shoulders of mutton, and of shoulders of camels, to write on, a method anciently adopted by other tribes of the Arabs, who had letters, but wanted traffic to accommodate them with more convenient materials; therefore their books of poems, and matters they took delight to write, were only so many of those blade-bones tied together upon a string. This Bashar came afterwards to be one of Mahommed's disciples, and followed him in his wars till poisoned at Chaibar.

Now, allowing the Alcoran of the Mahommedans to be writ in so elegant a style, and the supposed author thereof to be such a rude and illiterate barbarian, an important and necessary question will arise, who were his assistants, by whose help this book was composed, and the imposture forged? And there is so much the more reason for this, because the book itself contains so many particulars of the Jewish and Christian religions, which necessarily imply that those who had a hand therein were skilled in both, which Mahommed, who was born an idolator, and had lived so for the first forty years of his life, among a people that were altogether illiterate, cannot be supposed to have been, notwithstanding we must allow him to have possessed great natural parts and subtlety. But, indeed, it is a question not easily resolved, because the nature of the thing required secresy—the scene of this imposture being at least six hundred miles within the country of Arabia, amidst those barbarous nations who all too readily embraced it, and would not afterwards permit any of any other religion to live among them.

It could not at this distance be so well inquired into by those

who were most interested to discover the frauds, and therefore an exact statement cannot be reasonably expected. However, we shall give all the satisfactory accounts that can be met with from any credible author that has obliged the world with a history of it. That Mahommed composed his Alcoran by the assistance of others was a thing well known at Mecca when he first broached his imposture there; and his opposers often made this objection, of which he himself complains more than once in his Alcoran—particularly in the 25th chapter, he has these words: "They say that the Alcoran is nothing but a lie of thy own invention, and others have been assisting to thee again." Upon which the commentators say the persons here meant were the servants of a certain sword-smith at Mecca, who were Christians, with whom Mahommed was wont to converse, that he might have the better information from them about the Old and New Testament.

His opponents did not mean those with whom Mahommed publicly conversed, but his private confederates, whom he secretly made use of at home in the framing of the whole imposture. And these words in the Alcoran particularly point at one of those: "I know they will say that a man hath taught him the Alcoran, but he whom they presume to have taught him is a Persian by nation, and speaks the Persian language; but the Alcoran is in the Arabic tongue, full of instruction and eloquence." Now, who this Persian was, Friar Richard, in his "Confutation of the Mahommedan Religion," helps us to understand: for he tells us, in his 13th chapter, that Mahommed being an illiterate person, had for his helper in forging his imposture, among others, one Abdia Ben Salon, a Persian Jew, whose name he afterwards changed to make it suit with the Arabic dialect, into Abdollah Ebn Salem; and Cantacuzenus and Cardinal Cusa say the same thing; and most of those who write of this imposture mention him as the chief architect made use of by Mahommed in framing it. The same Friar Richard, in the 6th chapter of the same tract, tells us he was the person pointed at in this passage of the Alcoran; and he is the same

Persian, who, by his skill in making an entrenchment at the Battle of the Ditch, saved Mahommed and all his army. This Friar was a very crafty person, and so well versed in all the learning of the Jews, that he had commenced Rabbi amongst them; and from him Mahommed seems to have received whatsoever of the rites and customs of the Jews he has ingrafted into his new religion. For Judaism making a considerable part of it, and many of the particulars being drawn from the abstruser parts of the Talmudic learning, this unavoidably shows so able a helper to have been in the whole project. And this matter is further cleared by what John Andreas, an Alfacki, or a doctor of the Mahommedan law, who turned Christian, says of him.

This author informs us, from authentic testimonies of the Arabian writers, with which he was thoroughly acquainted, that Abdollah Ebn Salem, whom he, or rather his interpreter, corruptly calls Abdala Salem, was for ten years together the person by whose hand all the pretended revelations of the Impostor were first written; and therefore he was undoubtedly a main contriver in the forging of them. There is extant, at the end of the Latin Alcoran, published by Bibliander, a treatise translated out of Arabic into Latin, by Herman Desmata, which, by way of dialogue between Mahommed and this Abdollah, lays before us a great many of the fooleries of the Mahommedan religion; which tract helps us to correct the name, which is in Friar Richard's tract very corruptly writ, as being only a translation at the third hand, from the Greek copy of Demetrius Cydonius, for the use of the Emperor Cantacuzenus, from the original Latin, which is now lost.

Mahommed, besides this Jew, had a Christian monk for his assistant; and it plainly appears that he had such a one, by the many particulars in his Alcoran relating to the Christian religion. There are several authors who speak of him without giving him any other name than that of a Nestorian monk; but the author of "The Disputation against a Mahommedan," which is epitomised in "The Historicum Speculum of Vincentius Belloyacensis," and from thence printed at the end of Bibliander's "Latin

Alcoran," calls him Sergius. Hence it is that the western writers have so often spoken of him under that name, though in the east they know nothing of him by it; for all the writers there call him Bahira; and Friar Richard, who, in the year 1210, went on purpose to Bagdad to search into the mystery of Mahommedanism, by reading their books, and who after his return wrote that judicious confutation above-mentioned, tells us of this Bahira as an assistant to Mahommed in forging his false religion. So do also Catacuzenus, Bartholomew Edenssenus, and the other Greek, author of "The Confutation of Mahommed," published by Le Moyne; but none of them say a word of Sergius. So that it is plain that Sergius and Bahira are two different names for the same person. He was a Nestorian monk of Syria, whom the Mahommedans relate first took notice of Mahommed while a boy,* in the manner already mentioned, but he would have been too old to have acted a part in this imposture so many years after.

In short, Mahommed, in one of his journeys into Syria, lighting on this Bahira, either at Bostrau, or, as some say, at Jerusalem, and receiving great satisfaction from him in many points he desired to be informed in, contracted thereupon a particular friendship with him, and the monk not long after, being excommunicated, and expelled his monastery, fled to him to Mecca, where he became his assistant in framing his imposture, and when he had no further occasion for him, he put him to death to secure the secret; a very just reward for his apostacy and wickedness! If Sergius was the name he was known by in his monastery, Bahira was that which he afterwards assumed in Arabia, by which he has ever since been mentioned in those parts. The word signifies a camel, which, after some extraordinary merit, according to the ancient usage of the Arabs, had his ears slit, and was turned out from the rest of the herd to a free pasture, to work no more. And it is

* Mahommed was only thirteen years of age when he was first sent into Syria. R. R. M.

not to be doubted, says Dr. Prideaux, but this monk having told the tale of his expulsion from his monastery so much to his own advantage, that they believed at Mecca it was drawn upon him by a conduct which they reckoned there meritorious, had from thence the name given him, as best suiting the notion they had of his condition among them.

When Mahommed first appeared publicly as a prophet the people laughed at the ridiculousness of his pretensions, calling him sorcerer, magician, impostor, liar, &c.; so that for the first year he got nothing by them but scorn and contempt. However, he proceeded in his design, which he managed with great art, for he was a man of ready wit and good address. He bore all affronts without seeming to resent them, and applied himself to all sorts of people, without contemning the meanest, and was very courteous both in giving and receiving visits. The great ones he soothed with flattering praises, and the poor he relieved with gifts and alms; and he carried himself towards all men with that insinuating art in which he exceeded all men living, so that at length he surmounted all the difficulties which so daring an impostor must necessarily encounter; and several other new proselytes came unto him, among whom was Omar Ebno'l Chatab, who was one of his successors, and then a considerable man in Mecca. His example was followed by divers others, so that in the fifth year of his pretended mission, he had increased his followers to the number of nine-and-thirty.

The Misra, or night journey to Heaven is placed in the 12th year of his apostolate. The story, how absurd soever it is, yet being firmly believed as a main article of their creed by all the professors of the Mahommedan religion, and set down in all the books of their authentic traditions, it is proper to give an account in this place, before we proceed any further. We are told by Dean Prideaux that, as he lay in his bed one night, he heard a knocking at his door, which he opened, and there found the angel Gabriel, with seventy pairs of wings expanded from his sides, whiter than snow, and clearer than crystal, and the beast Alborak standing by him, which they say is that on which the prophets of old

used to ride when they were carried from one place to another, for the execution of the Divine command. Mahommed describes him to be as white as milk, and of a mixed nature, between an ass and a mule, and of a size between both; and of that extraordinary swiftness, so as to be as quick as lightning, from which he had his name, that being the Arabic word for it. Gabriel kindly embracing Mahommed at the door, with a very sweet and pleasant countenance saluted him in the name of God, and said he was sent to bring him to God in Heaven, where he should see strange mysteries, not lawful to be beheld by any other mortal, and then bid him get upon the Alborak. The beast would not let him mount him till he had prayed for him, and promised him a place in paradise, and then he received him very quietly; and in the twinkling of an eye, Gabriel guiding the bridle, he carried him from Mecca to Jerusalem, where, at the gate of the Temple, all the prophets and saints departed appeared and saluted him; and from thence attending him into the chief oratory, where he prayed twice, they desired him to pray for them, and so departed. Upon which Mahommed, with the angel Gabriel going out of the Temple, found there a ladder of light ready fixed for them, which they immediately ascended, leaving the Alborak there tied to a rock till their return.

On their arrival at the first heaven Gabriel knocked at the door, and having informed the porter who he was, and that he brought Mahommed, the friend of God, with him by his command, he immediately opened the gates, which were of a prodigious largeness. He tells us this first heaven was all of pure silver; that there were stars hanging from it by gold chains, each of the bigness of Mount Noko, near Mecca, in Arabia; that angels kept watch and ward in them for the guard of Heaven, to keep off the devils from approaching near it, lest they should overhear and know what was done there. He met a decrepid old man at his first entrance, who was Adam, by whom he was immediately embraced, giving God thanks for so great a son, and then recommended himself to his prayers. As

he entered farther he saw multitudes of angels in all manner of shapes; some in that of men, others like birds, and some again in that of beasts of all sorts. Among those of birds, he saw a cock as white as snow, having his wings all bedecked with pearls and carbuncles, and of so prodigious a bigness, that his feet standing upon the first heaven, his head reached up to the second, which was at the distance of five hundred years' journey from it, according to the usual rates of travelling here on earth; but others hyperbolizing much higher, tell us that the head of the cock reached up through the seven heavens, as far as the throne of God. This cock, the impostor tells us is the chief angel of the cocks, that he joins with God every morning in singing a holy hymn, and that his crowing is then so loud that all hear him in Heaven and earth, except men and fairies, and then all the other cocks that are in Heaven and earth crow also. But when the Day of Judgment draws near, then God shall command him to draw in his wings and crow no more, which shall be a sign that that day is at hand. The Mahommedans look upon this cock to be in that great favour with God, that it is a common saying amongst them, that there are three voices which God always hears; the first is that of him who is constantly reading the Alcoran; secondly, the voice of him that early every morning prays for the pardon of his sins; and the third, the voice of this cock when he crows, which, they say, is ever most acceptable to God.

Now, all this trumpery about the cock Abdollah helped Mahommed to out of the Talmudists, for it is borrowed from them with some small variations.

The impostor is pleased to inform us, that he ascended from this first heaven into the second, which was at the distance of five hundred years' journey above it, and this he makes to be the distance of every one of the seven heavens above each other. The gates being opened to him here, as in the other, he met Noah at his entrance, who, rejoicing exceedingly to see him, recommended himself to his prayers. This heaven, which he says was all of pure gold, contained twice as many angels as

the former, one of which was of a prodigious size; for his feet being placed on the second heaven, his head reached to the third. From the second he ascended to the third heaven, which was made of precious stones, where at the entrance he met Abraham, who also recommended himself to his prayers. Here he saw a vast many more angels than in the former heaven, and among them another great one of so prodigious a size, that the distance between both his eyes was as much as seventy thousand days' journey.

Ascending up into the fourth heaven, he represents it all made of emeralds, at the entrance into which he met Joseph, the son of Jacob, who recommended himself to his prayers; and here he saw a vastly greater number of angels than in the former, and among them another great angel, as high as from this fourth to the fifth heaven, who was continually weeping, making great lamentation, and mourning, and this, as Gabriel told him, was for the sins of men, and the destruction which thereby they brought upon themselves.

In the fifth heaven, which was made of adamant, he found Moses, who, in like manner, desired him to pray for him; here also he saw the number of angels much increased beyond what he had seen in the former heavens.

In the sixth heaven, which was all of carbuncle, he found John the Baptist, who made the same request to him as the rest had done, in respect to his prayers, and here also the number of the angels was much increased beyond what he had seen in any of the former heavens.

Having got at last to the seventh heaven, which was all made of Divine light, here he found Jesus Christ; and it is very well worth observing that now he alters his style, for he does not say, as of the rest, that Christ recommended himself to his prayers, but that he recommended himself to Christ, desiring him to pray for him; whereby he acknowledged him certainly to be the greater person. And though Mahommed had carried his imposture to such a height, yet he seems to retain some grains of modesty in this his extravagant relation;

but perhaps his only intention herein was to pursue his usage of flattering the Christians upon all occasions, during the whole scene of his pretended mission. Here, he says, he found a far greater number of angels than in all the other heavens together, and among them one extraordinary angel, having seventy thousand heads, and in every head seventy thousand tongues, and every tongue uttering seventy thousand distinct voices at the same time, with which he continued, day and night, incessantly praising God.

The angel Gabriel, having conducted him thus far, told Mahommed he was not allowed to go any farther, and therefore directed him to ascend the rest of the way to the throne of God by himself, which he said he performed with great difficulty, passing through waters and snow, and many other such difficult passages, till he came where he heard a voice saying unto him, "Oh, Mahomet, salute thy Creator!" from whence, ascending higher, he came into a place where he saw a vast extension of light, of that exceeding brightness, that his eyes could not bear it; and this was the habitation of the Almighty, where his throne was placed; on the right side of which, he says God's name and his own were written in these Arabic words—"La Ella Ellalla Mahommed resul Ellah," i. e. "There is no God but God, and Mahommed is his prophet," which is the creed of the Mahommedans; which words he also says he found written upon all the gates of the seven heavens which he passed through. Being approached to the presence of God, as near as within two bowshots, he tells us he saw him sitting on his throne, with a covering of seventy thousand veils before his face; that on his drawing thus near he put forth his hand, and laid it upon him, which was so excessively cold that it pierced to the very marrow of his back, and he could not bear it; that God, after entering into a very familiar converse with him, revealed unto him a great many hidden mysteries, made him understand the whole of his law, and gave him many things in charge concerning his instructing men in the knowledge of it; and finally bestowed on him several privileges above the rest of

mankind: as, that he should be the most perfect of all creatures; that at the Day of Judgment he should be honoured and advanced above all the rest of mankind; that he should be the redeemer of all that believe in him; that he should have the knowledge of all languages; and that the spoils of all he should conquer in war, should belong to him alone.

This done, he returned and found the angel Gabriel tarrying for him at the place where he had left him; who, conducting him back through all the seven heavens the same way that he had brought him, set him again upon the Alborak, which he left tied at Jerusalem, and then, taking the bridle in his hand, brought him back to Mecca, in the same manner as he had conducted him from thence, and all this within the space of the tenth part of the night.

When he came next morning to relate this extravagant fiction to the people, they received it as it really deserved, with universal ridicule; some laughed at the absurdity of the story, others, taking indignation at it, cried out shame on him for telling such an abominable lie; and in a way of reproach, bid him ascend to heaven by daylight, there immediately in the presence of them all, and they would believe him. And even of his own disciples, several were so ashamed of the story that they quitted his party, and more would have followed their example, but that Abou-Beker came seasonably for him, to put a stop to the defection, by vouching the truth of all that Mahommed had related, and professed his firm belief of the whole of it; for which reason he had ever after the title of Assadeck, that is, the Just, because of the extraordinary merit of his faith in this particular. And whoever becomes a Mahommedan must have the same faith also, only there has been this question moved among the Mahommedans, whether this was only a vision of the night, or a real journey.

The event showed the impostor was not mistaken in his device, for how ridiculous soever this fable of his journey to Heaven appeared at first to be, yet, upon the whole, he carried his point, and obtained all that by his project, which he pro-

posed to himself by it; for the whole of it at length went down with those who had swallowed the rest of the imposture. From thenceforward all his sayings came to be esteemed as sacred truths, brought down from Heaven, and all his followers carefully observed every word that at any time dropped from so enlightened a person as this story supposed him to be, as well as every action he performed, that any way related to his religion, which, after his decease, being all carefully collected from the memories of such as had conversed with him, make up those volumes of traditions.

It is very falsely stated that no miracles are claimed by Mahommed, or for him by his followers and the commentators of his revelations. His pretended night journey to Heaven was passed off for a miraculous performance, and, as such, was claimed by him. There are several miracles related by his disciples, which Mahommed is said to have wrought; as, that he cleft the moon into two, that trees went forth to meet him, that water flowed from between his fingers, that the stones saluted him, that he fed a great company with a little food, that a bear groaned in his presence, that a camel complained to him, that a shoulder of mutton told him of its being poisoned; and several other equally absurd marvels.

Marracci, the most learned of the writers on, and translators of, the Koran, to whom the world is mainly indebted for Sale's version from the preceding author's translation from the Arabic, in his "Refutatio Alcorani," fol. 1698, cites from the Arabian historians of Mahommed and his mission, several miracles performed in honour of the prophet, one of which, at his birth, another in his childhood, and another at his marriage, I shall make mention of:—

"1. They assert that Mahommed came into the world surrounded with a light, which not only illuminated the chamber wherein he lay, but also the whole country round about. 2. That as soon as he was born he fell upon his knees, and, bending all except his two fore-fingers, with uplifted hands, and his face turned towards Heaven, pronounced distinctly these words,

'Allah acbar,' &c., that is, 'God is great; there is no other God but one, and I am his prophet.'"

The grave Abulfeda relates that in his childhood two men in white, who turned out to be angels, having found the blessed child in a field, opened his breast, took out his heart, and squeezed therefrom two black drops. The two angelic operators must have quickly replaced the young Saracen's heart, for when his nurse ran out to seek for the cut child, she found him capering about all sound and whole.

Other more spiritual Arab authors are good enough to explain this singular circumstance:—They say that when Mahommed's breast was ripped open, the angel took out his heart and squeezed out of it, the black drop which is the consequence of original sin, and the cause of all sinful thoughts. This grand discovery of an ingenious device for getting rid of "the bad drop" there is in every man born of woman, was worthy of two angels. But it is to be feared there were more bad drops of the *fomes peccati* than one in the heart of Mahommed, that were not to be squeezed out by any ordinary proceeding. But all true believers hold, and are bound to hold, that Mahommed was the most perfect creature and the purest that ever came out of the hands of the Almighty.

Another miracle is recorded on the occasion of the marriage of Mahommed with the old widow of forty-five years, of the rich merchant of Mecca, who had already buried two husbands. On that happy occasion we are told, "The nuptials were celebrated with great festivity, with mirth, dancing, and music. Heaven was filled with unusual joy, and the whole earth was intoxicated with delight." Some writers assert that "The whole earth was intoxicated with joy, and a voice came out of the Heavens pronouncing the union happy, the boys and girls of Paradise were brought out on that happy occasion in bridal robes, the hills and valleys jumped for joy to the sound of unearthly music, and there was a fragrant perfume spread over the face of nature."

What could Mr. Tennyson say more of the nuptials of some

chivalrous prince and peerless princess, in the most florid pastoral style, and hyperbolical strains of orientalized poetry?

In the year of our Lord 622, the party of the Impostor (in the eighth year of his mission) beginning to grow formidable at Mecca, the city passed a decree, forbidding any more to join themselves to him; it signified nothing, however, as long as his uncle Taleb was alive; but he dying about two years after, and the chief magistracy falling into the hands of Abou Sophian, of the house of Ommiah, then one of his most violent opposers, his enemies then prosecuted him with such success that they soon put a stop to the further progress of his imposture at Mecca; so that he was so far from having any more new proselytes that many of his followers deserted him. Being thus baffled in his expectations at Mecca, and his uncle, Abbas, having lived mostly at Tayib, another town of Hagiar, sixty miles distant from Mecca, and having great influence there, he made a journey thither, with a design to propagate his imposture; but not being able in a whole month to gain one proselyte, he returned to Mecca.

Kadigha, his wife, being dead, after she had lived two-and-twenty years with him, he took two other wives; these were Ayesha, the daughter of Abou-Beker, and Zewda, the daughter of Zama; and a while after added to them Haphsa, the daughter of Omar; whereby making himself son-in-law to the three principal men of his party, by their alliance the more firmly bound them to his interests. Ayesha was then but six years old, and therefore he remained affianced to her till two years after, when she was full eight; for it is usual in those countries, as it is all over India, for women at that age to enter into marriage.

After Mahommed had published this fiction, and the revolt of many of his disciples consequent upon it, his adversaries grew up so fast in strength against him that he could no longer protect his adherents as he had hitherto done; but some of them, to the number of about four hundred, having rendered themselves more than ordinarily obnoxious to the Government

by some indirect practices against it, were forced to fly from Mecca to Nagath, King of Ethiopia, where, by virtue of the letters which they brought with them from Mahommed, they obtained protection, though the men of Mecca sent two of their principal citizens after them, in an embassy to that prince, to require him to give them up. Nay, Mahommed, and the rest that stayed behind, found it very difficult for them to subsist there any longer. But what he lost at Mecca, he made up at Medina, a city lying at the northern end of the Hedjaz, two hundred and seventy miles distant from Mecca; which being partly inhabited by Jews, and partly by heretical Christians, it seems these different parties not well agreeing, the factions and feuds that arose amongst them, drove one of the parties to Mahommed, and in the thirteenth year of his pretended mission, there came seventy-three men from thence, who embraced his imposture, and swore fealty to him; upon which he chose twelve of them, whom he retained awhile with him at Mecca, to instruct them in his new religion, and then sent them back again to Medina, to be his twelve disciples in that town.

As soon as Mahommed's flight came to be known, they sent out parties after him, which he escaped with difficulty, by hiding himself for a time in a cave till the heat of their pursuit was over. He came on the 24th of September to Yatreb, where he was received with great acclamations by the party that invited him thither; but whether they were Jews or Christians is not certainly known, but they were more likely to be the latter, by what he says of each of them in the 5th chapter of his Alcoran, which was one of the first he published after his coming to Yatreb; for his words are these:—"Thou shalt find the Jews to be very great enemies to the true believers, and the Christians to have great inclination and amity towards them; for they have priests and religious that are humble, who have eyes full of tears when they hear mention made of the doctrine which God has inspired into thee, because of their knowledge of the truth; and say, 'Lord, we believe in thy law, write us in the number of them who profess thy unity. Who shall hinder us

from believing in God? in the truth wherein we have been instructed? We desire with passion, oh, Lord, to be in the number of the Just!'" By this appears the deplorable decay into which the many divisions and distractions that then reigned in the Eastern Church had brought the Christian religion, when its professors could so easily desert it for that gross imposture which that illiterate barbarian proposed to them.

After his flight from Mecca, having thus settled himself at Yatreb, subsequently called Medina, he made it the place of his residence ever after to the time of his death ; for which reason, losing from thenceforward the name of Yatreb, it came to be called Medina-el-Nabi, *i. e.*, the City of the Prophet.

From this flight of Mahommed, the Hegira, which is the Era of the Mahommedans, begins its computation; it was at first appointed by Omar, the third Caliph of the Saracens. It takes its beginning from the 16th day of July, in the year of our Lord 622.

The first thing Mahommed did, after he had settled himself at Medina, was to marry his daughter Fatima to his cousin Ali. She was the only child then living of six he had by his wife Kadigha, and, indeed, the only one which he had, notwithstanding the multitude of his wives, that survived him, whom he exceedingly loved, and was wont to speak of with great commendation.

The Impostor, having now obtained the end he had long been driving at, that is, a town at his command, where to arm his party and head them with security for the further prosecution of his designs, he entered upon a new scene. He had hitherto been preaching up his imposture for thirteen years together, but for the remaining part of his life, which was ten years, he took up the sword and fought for it. They had teazed and perplexed him for a long time at Mecca with questions and objections and disputes about his doctrine,whereby, being often troubled, he, from henceforward, forbade all manner of dispute about his religion.

He now told his followers the way his religion was to be

propagated was not by disputing, but by fighting; and, therefore, he commanded them all to arm themselves, and slay with the sword all those who would not embrace it, unless they submitted to pay an annual tribute for the redemption of their lives.

When the Impostor had sufficiently infused this doctrine into his disciples, he proceeded, in the next place, to put it in practice, and having set up his standard, he summoned all his followers to attend it in arms; and having enrolled them all for the war, he gave his standard to his uncle Hamza, constituting him thereby his standard-bearer; and out of the special confidence he had in him, sent him out on the first expedition which was undertaken in his cause; for, understanding that the caravans of Mecca was now on the road in its return from Syria, he ordered Hamza, with a party of thirty horse, to waylay and plunder them. Hamza accordingly posted himself in a wood, in the country of Yamana, by which they were to pass; but finding, upon their approach, that they were guarded with three hundred men, sent from Mecca to convoy them, he did not attempt to attack them, but fled for safety to Medina; and several other expeditions were undertaken this year with no better success.

The next year, which was that of our Lord 623, and the second of the Hegira, a very rich caravan going from Mecca towards Syria, and carrying with them a great quantity of goods and money, which belonged to the merchants of Mecca, who traded into that country, Mahommed went out in person with three hundred and nineteen men to intercept it, and coming up with them at a place called Beder, though he found them guarded with a convoy of a thousand men, under the command of Abu Sophian, he attacked them with so much resolution and bravery that he gained the victory. Abu Sophian made as good a retreat as he could to Mecca, and saved the greatest part of the caravan, at which Mahommed's men much repined. However, there were great spoils gained in this battle, about the distribution of which a quarrel arose between those of Mecca, who were his

followers, and those of Medina, the former of whom would have a larger share than the other. Mahommed, to salve the controversy, composed the eighth chapter of his Alcoran, wherein he adjudged the fifth part to himself, and the rest to be equally distributed between them.

The success of this battle gave great encouragement to the Impostor and his party, of which he frequently boasted in his Alcoran; and would have it believed that two miracles were wrought for his obtaining it. First, that God made his enemies see his army as double to what they really were, which helped to dismay them; and secondly, that he sent troops of angels to his assistance, who helped to overcome them.

Mahommed this year altered the Kebla, that is, the place towards which they directed their prayers. Mahommed had from the beginning of his imposture directed his disciples to pray with their faces towards Jerusalem, which he used to call the holy city, and the city of the prophets; and intended to have ordered his pilgrimage thither, and to have made it the principal place where all his sect were to worship. But now, finding his followers still retained a superstitious veneration for the temple of Mecca, which for several ages had been the chief place of the idolatrous worship of the Arabs, and that it would be a very prevalent argument to reconcile his fellow citizens to him, if he still preserved their temple in its former veneration, he altered his first law to serve his present purpose, and directed his disciples, from this time forward, to pray with their faces towards Mecca; and that it should be the chief place of worship for all of his religion, to which they were still to perform their pilgrimages as in former times. And he became the more inclined to this change out of his aversion to the Jews, against whom, having about this time contracted an irreconcileable hatred, he did not think fit any longer to conform with them in this rite; and the reason he gives for this alteration is this, that his followers might be distinguished from them. However, many of his disciples were so offended at it, that judging there was no truth or stability in his religion,

which was so often given to change, several left him in consequence.

From this time, the more to magnify the temple of Mecca, and to give the greater honour and reputation to it, we have all those fabulous stories invented which the Impostor tells us concerning it.

Mahommed, this same year (623), appointed the month of Ramadan to be a month of fasting. When he came first to Medina, and found the Jews observing the celebration of their great fast of expiation on the tenth of their first month, he asked what it meant, and being told that it was a fast appointed by Moses, he replied that he had more to do with Moses than they, and had therefore ordained the tenth day of Mohorram, the first month of the Arab year, to be a solemn fast with his Mussulmans in imitation of it; which, by a name also borrowed from the Jews, he also called Ashura, the same with the Hebrew Asher, the tenth being the tenth day of the month Tisri, on which this fast of the expiation was celebrated among them.

The battle of Obud, which had like to prove fatal to the Impostor, happened about the end of this year; for Abou Sophian, to revenge the last year's affront, marched against him with an army of three thousand foot and two hundred horse; and having possessed himself of Mount Obud, which was but four miles distant from Medina, he so distressed the place from that post that Mahommed was forced to hazard a battle to dislodge him, though the most he could make was but a thousand men with which to encounter him. However, he had the better in the first conflict, but being at last borne down by numbers, many of his men were slain, and among them fell his uncle Hamza, his standard-bearer. Mahommed himself was grievously wounded in many places, and had certainly been slain but that Telha, one of his companions, and nephew to Abu Beker, came to his rescue; however, he received a wound in his hand in this action, which deprived him of the use of some of his fingers ever after.

Mahommed, in the fourth year of the Hegira, waged war against the Nadirites, a tribe of the Jewish Arabs in his neighbourhood, whom he pressed so hard that he forced them to quit their castles; part of them retired to Chaibar, a city belonging to those of that religion, while others fled into Syria, who were pursued by Mandir Ebn Omar, with a party of men of Medina, and put to the sword, all save one man who escaped. In the same year he fought the battle of Beder, and had many other skirmishes with those that refused to submit to him, with various successes.

While his army was engaged in these expeditions, some of his principal men, engaging at play and drink, in the heat of their cups, fell to quarrelling, and raised such disturbances among his followers, that they had like to come to an open rupture, to the confounding of him and all his designs; and therefore, to prevent such mischiefs for the future, he forbade the use of wine, and all games of hazard for ever.

In the fifth chapter of his Alcoran, where he promulgates his law about this affair, he says:—"The devil desires to sow dissension and hatred among you through wine and games of chance, to divert you from remembering God, and praying unto him. Abandon wine and games of chance, be obedient to God and the Prophet his apostle, take heed to yourselves."

In the 6th year, and 3rd of the Hegira, Mahommed subdued the Lahianites, the Mustalachites, and several other tribes of the Arabs; the first of these were of the posterity of the Chazaites, whom Cosa expelled out of Mecca. He put most of the men, according to his bloody mode of proceeding with the vanquished, to the sword, and took their wives and children captives, among whom finding Juweira, the daughter of Hareth, a woman of admirable beauty, he took her to wife, and for her sake released all her kindred that were found amongst the captives. Being now much increased in strength by the many advantages he had obtained in war, he marched his army against Mecca; and at Hadibia, a place near that city, on the road from thence to Jodda,

a battle was fought between them with uncertain victory: and therefore a truce was concluded, that all those in Mecca, who were for Mahommed, might have liberty to come to him, and that those who, on the other hand, had a mind to leave him, might with the same liberty return to their houses in Mecca; but that for the future, if any of the citizens of Mecca should go over to Mahommed without the consent of the Governor of the city, he should be bound on demand to deliver them up to him; and that if Mahommed or any of his party had a mind to come into the city, they were free to do it at any time during the truce, provided they came unarmed, in a peaceable manner, and tarried not above three days at a time.

This truce having very much confirmed Mahommed, he, from that time, assumed the dignity and state of a Prince and Pontiff, and was inaugurated by the chief men of his army under a tree near Medina. Mahommed's followers having now free access by the truce to go to Medina, he thenceforward ordained them to make those pilgrimages thither, which have ever since with so much religion been observed by all this sect once every year. This was an ancient rite of the heathen Arabs, to go thither yearly to worship their false deities, to which, having been long devoted, the usage was had in great veneration among them, and therefore Mahommed thought not fit to ruffle them with any innovation in this matter. The crafty impostor taught them concerning it, as he did of all the other heathen rites of the Arabs, which he found necessary to retain; that it was a command from God to Abraham and Ishmael, annually to observe this pilgrimage, and that it was given to them on their rebuilding the Caaba; and that at first it was used to the honour of God, in the coming of all the Arabs thither once every year, there to worship before him in one holy assembly, in the same manner as the Jews had their solemn festivals thrice a year at Jerusalem; but that in process of time it became perverted to idolatry, from which he was now commanded to restore it to its primitive use. And in the making of this establishment, he had no small regard to his native

city, that he might preserve to it the same benefit of this pilgrimage which it had so long enjoyed; and in thus providing for the interest of that people in the very religion he was framing, he thought he might the easier bring them over: wherein he was not indeed mistaken.

As soon as Mahommed had finished his mosque at Medina, he always, if present, himself officiated both in praying and preaching to the people, for which he had no other convenience at first than a piece of beam, or the stump of a palm tree driven into the ground, on the top of which he leaned when he prayed; but being now advanced so high, he thought it too mean for his dignity, and, therefore, by the advice of one of his wives, he caused a pulpit to be made with two steps up into it, and a seat within to sit upon.

He led his army this year against Chaibar, a city of the Jewish Arabs, who, being routed in the field, he took the place by storm, and whilst there, those who are the magnifiers of Ali, tell this miracle of him:—That in the assault, Sampson-like, he plucked up one of the gates of the city, which was of that weight, says Abulfeda, that eight other men could not move it, and held it before him for a shield, to defend himself against the besieged, till the city was taken. Mahommed having entered the town, took up his quarters in the house of Hareth, one of the principal inhabitants, whose daughter, Zamah, making ready a shoulder of mutton for his supper, poisoned it. Those who are for ascribing miracles to the impostor, tell us that the shoulder of mutton spoke to him, and discovered it was poisoned; but it seems it was too late, for Basher, one of his companions, eating greedily of it, fell down dead on the place, and though Mahommed did not immediately incur the same fate, because, not liking the taste, he swallowed only some morsels of the poisoned meat, yet he was never well after this, and died of it about three years after.

Of Mahommed's belief in magic, and of that of his countrymen, and of the evil effects of one of its practises generally believed in in the middle ages all over Europe, we have a

striking illustration in the following passage, taken from Ockley's life of Mahommed in the History of the Saracens :— "In this year, Jannabi mentions Mahommed's being bewitched by the Jews. Having made a waxen image of him, they hid it in a well, together with a comb and a tuft of hair tied in eleven knots. The prophet fell into a very wasting condition, till he had a dream that informed him where these implements of witchcraft were, and accordingly had them taken away. In order to untie the knots, Gabriel read to him the two last chapters of the Koran, consisting of eleven verses; each verse untied a knot, and, when all were untied, he recovered."

Mahommed's next successes were the reducing of Beder, Wariha, and Selulima, towns belonging to the Jewish Arabs, under his obedience, on articles that they should continue in their former habitations, paying one-half of the incomes of their date trees, for a tribute every year, but to be at his discretion to compel them when he would; and so they dwelt in their former possessions without disturbance, till the reign of Omar, who, pretending that Mahommed had given charge in his last sickness, not to permit two religions in Arabia, drove them all out.

The impostor, by these many acquisitions, having increased his army to ten thousand men, resolved, on the 8th of the Hegira, A.D. 629, to make himself master of Mecca, and pretending the inhabitants had broken the truce, he came so suddenly upon them that they were forced to yield to him. Al-Abbas, one of Mahommed's uncles, who, though of his religion, had, it seems, still tarried at Mecca, saved his life by turning Mahommedan. Having got possession of this important place, and put to death those who had been most violent against him, the rest readily embraced his religion; and then he went on roundly to work to purge the Caaba of its idols, and to consecrate the temple anew to his religion. There were a multitude of idols within this temple, and as many without, standing round its area; all which he caused to be pulled down and destroyed, and the place to be totally cleared of them. The chief among these idols were those of Abraham and Ismael, within

the temple, and that of Hoball without; and the rest were of angels and prophets.

The news of Mahommed's having made himself master of Mecca, no sooner came to be known to the neighbouring Arabs, than the Hawazins, the Thakifians, and several other tribes, immediately drew together under the command of Melec Ebn Auf, to fall upon him before he should further augment his power. Mahommed having appointed Gayat Ebn Afad to be governor of Mecca, marched against them with twelve thousand men, and in the valley of Horaina, between Mecca and Tagis, ensued a fierce battle; and Mahommed, though much superior to the enemy, was beaten in the first rencounter, and driven back to the walls of Mecca, which disgrace he ascribed to the over confidence of his men in their numbers; but rallying his troops, and acting with more caution in the second conflict, he then, as he said, by the help of invisible troops of angels, gave his enemies such a total defeat, that he took from them their baggage, with their wives and children, and all their substance. These people, after the battle, sent ambassadors to him to desire the restoration of their wives and children; to whom Mahommed gave the choice, either to have them or their goods; but they choosing the first, he agreed to it, and divided the spoils among the soldiers.

Having now brought most parts of Arabia under his power, he, in the 9th of the Hegira, and the year of our Lord 630, turned his arms towards Syria, and possessed himself of Tabuc, a town belonging to the Greek empire; from whence falling on the princes of Dauma and Eyla, he forced them to become tributaries to him, and then returned to Medina. During his absence, the Tayifians, whom he had begun to besiege the former year, being much pressed by some of his lieutenants, to whom he had committed the prosecution of the war, they were forced to submit and embrace his imposture; an account of which being transmitted to him, he sent Abn Sophian to disarm them, and appointed Othman Ebn Abulas, to be their governor. This was the last year he went to war, at least in person.

The power of this impostor, by the 10th of the Hegira, and the year of our Lord 631, was so much increased, and the fame of it so terrified the rest of the Arabs, who had not yet felt his arms, that they all came in, submitted, and embraced his imposture; so that now his empire and religion became established over all Arabia, and he sent his lieutenants into all parts to govern in his name, and to destroy the idol temples everywhere, and to set up his new-invented religion. Most of the year being spent in making these sorts of regulations, Mahommed towards the end of it took a journey in pilgrimage to Mecca, and entered into it on the occasion of a great solemnity; a vast concourse of people resorted to him from all parts of Arabia, whom he instructed in his law, and then returned again to Medina. This his followers call the Pilgrimage of Valediction, because it was the last he made.

After his return to Medina, he began to decline in his health, through the force of the poison given him at Chaibar, which at length brought him so low, that on the 28th day of Saphur, in the 10th of the Hegira, and the year of our Lord 632, it forced him to take to his bed, and on the 12th of the following month he died, after having been sick thirteen days. The beginning of his illness was a slow fever, which at last made him delirious, upon which he called for pen, ink and paper, telling them he would dictate a book to them which should keep them from erring after his death. But Omar would not admit of it, saying the Alcoran was enough, and that the prophet, through the violence of his distemper, knew not what he said. But others there present were of a different mind, expressing a great desire that the book might be written; upon which a contention arose, which offended him so far that he bid them all be gone, saying it did not become them thus to contend in his presence.

Great confusion arose among his followers at his death, many of them would have it be believed that he could not die, saying: "How can he die, who is to be a witness to God for us? It cannot be so: he is not dead, but only taken away for a season,

and will return again as Jesus did." And therefore they flocked to the door of the house where the dead corpse lay, crying out, "Do not bury him, for the apostle of God is not dead!" Omar, being of the same mind, drew his sword, and swore if any one should say Mahommed was dead, he would cut him in pieces: "For," said he, "the apostle of God is not dead, but only gone for a season, as Moses, the son of Amram was gone from the children of Israel forty days, and then returned to them again."

To compose this disorder, Abu-Beker came in and cried out, "*Do you worship Mahommed, or the God of Mahommed? He is immortal, and liveth for ever; but as to Mahommed, he is certainly dead.*" And then he proved from several passages in the Alcoran, that he must die as well as other men. This satisfying Omar and his party, they then took it for granted that Mahommed was dead, and would no more return to life till the general resurrection. Upon the appeasing of this disorder there arose another to a much greater height about his burial. The Mohagerines, or those that accompanied him in his flight from Mecca, would have him carried thither to be buried; but the Ansars, or those of Medina, who joined with him, would have him buried where he died. Others had a fancy to carry his corpse to Jerusalem, to be there interred among the sepulchres of the prophets. And while each party strove to have their own way complied with, the contest grew so hot that they had all gone together by the ears had not the wisdom of Abu-Beker interposed, who told them he had often heard from the prophet himself, that prophets were to be buried in the place where they died, and then, without any more ado, he commanded the bed on which he lay to be pulled down, and a grave to be immediately dug under it, to which all consented, and there they interred him forthwith.

Mahommed survived his flight from Mecca ten years; he died in Medina in his sixty-second year, in A.D 632.

Dean Prideaux says Abulfeda and three other Arabian historians state that he had married no less than fifteen wives,

and had several concubines; but other historians say he had twenty-one wives, of whom five died before him, six were repudiated by him, and ten were alive at the time of his death, but the tenth had not been brought home to him when his last illness occurred, so that, in fact, he was only survived by nine wives. Their names were, Ayesha, Kaphsa, Zewda, Juweira, Sephia, Omm Selema, Omm Naliba, and Maimuna.

The best-beloved of all his wives was Ayesha, the daughter of Abou-Beker. We have already observed how he married her when very young; and though she was a very light woman, and had many intrigues, for which Mahommed was moved to repudiate her, yet he loved her so much that he could not part with her; but to save her reputation and his own, he composed the 24th chapter of the Alcoran, to declare from God her innocence; for therein he tells his followers that the charge against her was an imposture, and a most impudent lie.

Hapsha, the daughter of Omar, was next in favour to Ayesha, and Mahommed entrusted her with the keeping of the chest of his apostleship, wherein were laid up all the original papers of his pretended revelation, out of which the Alcoran was composed; and Abou-Beker, after the finishing of it, redelivered the original copy to her, to be kept in the same chest.

Zewda, of all his wives, was least in favour with him, and he had a design to put her away; but she pressed him earnestly that she might still have the reputation of being his wife, though she consented to a virtual separation.

Zainab was first the wife of Zeyd, his enfranchised slave, who being a woman of great beauty, Mahommed fell desperately in love with; but to prevent scandal, after he had done all he could to suppress his flame, he broke the matter to her, and caused Zeyd to put her away, that he might marry her. However, it gave great offence to his followers; but to salve the wound he inflicted on morality, he brought out the Chapter of Heresies in the Alcoran, where God is represented, declaring, that he had married Zainab to Mahommed, and given him free

liberty to act towards her according to his desire. She lived with him to the time of his death, and always gloried and valued herself before his other wives, because they were married to the Prophet by their parents and kindred, but she was married to him by God himself, who dwells above the seven Heavens.

It has been already stated that he married Juweira: Sephia was a Jewess, and descended of the priestly race, for which reason she was wont to boast that she had Aaron for her father, Moses for her uncle, and Mahommed for her husband. Besides these, he had a paramour, on whom he much doated, an Egyptian woman, and a Christian of the Jacobite sect. Ayesha and Haphsa reproached him violently for his conduct on this occasion, that he who called himself a Prophet sent from God to teach men righteousness, should do such wickedness. At which, being much confounded, he swore an oath of repentance which he did not keep, and they having again loaded him with reproaches both for his perjury and his adultery, retired to their relatives' abodes; which giving great offence, he had recourse to his old art, and produced a new revelation to justify his acts, called the Chapter of the Prohibition in the Alcoran, wherein he introduces God giving a sanction to his licentiousness. The first words of this chapter, which is the 66th, are: "Oh, Prophet, why dost thou forbid what God has allowed thee, that thou mayest please thy wives?"*

That his predominant passions were ambition and lust, is evident, by the course he took to gain empire and to indulge his appetites, and both passions run through the whole frame of his religion, there being scarcely a chapter in the Alcoran but lays down some law, of war and bloodshed, for the promoting of his ambition, or else gives some liberty for sensual enjoyments here,

* We must have recourse to Sale's translation for a literal version of this passage—"Oh, Prophet! why holdest thou that to be prohibited which God hath allowed thee, seeking to please thy wives. Since God is inclined to forgive and be merciful, God hath allowed thee the dissolution of your oaths: and God is your master, and he is knowing and wise."—See Sale's Koran, ch. 66, p. 456. This is the acme of turpitude and impiety, yet Sale has devoted a whole page of a note to an attempt not merely to extenuate the infamy of this passage, but to defend the impostor from Dean Prideaux's animadversions on it.—R. R. M.

or some promise for the gratification of them hereafter. As the gratifying his ambition and his lust was the main end of his imposture, so they both appeared continually through the whole contexture of it. His ambition at first had the predominancy, but when he began to be somewhat satiated by the power he had attained, his lust grew upon him with his age, and he seemed at length to be totally abandoned to it. Whatever laws he promulgated to restrain the sensuality of other men, he always took care to except himself from all restraint. He would not allow any other to have above four wives, but he reserved a liberty to himself to marry as many as he thought fit, without restraint, and to do as he pleased in his own family with his own property, in women.

In all these instances it plainly appears how much Mahommed made his imposture serve his lust, and other purposes: in a word, as his interest and designs varied, so he was forced to make his pretended revelations vary likewise; which is a thing so well known to those of his sect, that they all acknowledge it: and therefore where the contradictions are such, as that they are not able to solve them, they will have one of the contradicting passages to be revoked; and they reckon above 150 verses in the whole Koran which are thus revoked, which is the best shift they can make to salve the contradictions and inconsistencies of it; though they do thereby exceedingly betray the inconsistency of him who was the author of it.

Mahommed, in the beginning of his imposture, seemed more inclined to the Jews than the Christians; and in the first formation of his new-invented religion, favoured their opinions more than any other: but after his coming to Medina, he conceived such disgust against them, that he became their most bitter and irreconcileable enemy, and used them with greater cruelty in his wars than any other people he had to deal with. But he was much more favourable to the Christians, and whenever they fell under his power, they had always good terms from him. His general rule, and which he laid a strict obligation upon all his followers to observe, was to fight for the propaga-

tion of his religion, and there were only two conditions on which he granted peace to any he had to do with, and these were either to come in to his religion, or submit to be tributaries to him. They that did the former had the same privileges and immunities as the rest of his followers; but the others had only the benefit of his protection, as to their goods and persons, and the free exercise of their religion, without any other privilege or advantage whatsoever, for which every man paid an annual tribute. But those who would not submit and make their peace with him on one of those two conditions, were put to the sword.

CHAPTER III.

The Koran.—Extracts from it, illustrative of its principles and teachings.

We learn from the preceding biographical sketch of Mahommed, that the greatest enemy Christianity ever encountered in this world, was the Arch-Impostor of Arabia. He first broached his spurious revelations in the year A.D. 609. He was then in his 38th year. With the assistance of Jews, Christian monks, and priests of heretical sects, Nestorian and Arian, Jacobite and Ebionite, he built up a gigantic structure of fraud and falsehood, mainly compounded of Judaism, Nestorianism, and Arianism. For several years his labours were confined to his own household and immediate friends and relatives, and a small portion of his townspeople.

He fled from Mecca, his native town, on account of the opposition he encountered in the year A.D. 622, from which event in his Apostolic mission, the Hegira, or era of the Mahommedan religion, is dated.

For ten years from that era the new religion of the Arab impostor was propagated, principally by the sword. Mahommed died at Medina, in the 62nd year of his age, in the year A.D. 632, in the estimation of Sale and other eulogists of the psuedo-prophet, a great reformer and benefactor of the human race; in the opinion of De Bussieres, the greatest pest and most dreadful scourge of the human race which hell ever sent upon the earth:—

" Mahometus illorum temporum maxima labes,
Orbis pestilentia, teterrimaque inferni vomica."*

The English and German panegyrists of Mahommed, and apologists of Mahommedanism, attribute the success of their great Arab Reformer's mission to the superstitions and corruptions of the Christian church at that period, and the disorders, covetousness, and worldliness of the priests and prelates of the Catholic religion in the East, as well as in the West.

Nothing is attributed to the power of the devil; the pride and ambition of a wily unscrupulous Arab; the influences, moreover, of an ardent imagination, a sanguine temperament, the inventive mind of a man of a potent will, of powerful passions, and of strong conceptive powers. Nothing to the influence of cerebral disease of periodical recurrence, in the form of epileptic seizures, exhibited in swoons and trances, in fits, spoken of by his cotemporaries as visitations of the sacred disease, as miraculous manifestations in the holy times of visions and revelations.

It will be in vain to look in the writings of Sale and his followers for any reference to this very important subject, of the Apostle being liable to seizures of syncope, analogous in the accounts given of them, to those of epileptic fits. Yet of the fact mentioned by some of his cotemporaries, by several of the earliest commentators on the Koran, by the earliest Christian writers who treat of Mahommed, no reasonable doubt can be entertained. The suppression of this fact on the part of Sale is the more remarkable, as he was a man, not only of extensive Oriental erudition, but an able and judicious writer, when Catholicism and Christianity, prior to Protestantism, had not to be noticed and reviled by him. It never seems to have occurred to Sale and his compeers, that there were circumstances in operation at the time of Mahommed's appearance on the stage of public life in the character of an apostle, a warrior, a reformer, and a prince, affecting the destinies of surround-

* Flosculi Historiarum Delibati.

ing empires and states, having had a mighty influence over the fortunes and destinies of the people of the East. The Empire of Persia was then tottering on its foundations. The Empire of Rome in the West was at the mercy of Goths and Vandals. The Empire of Rome in the East was enervated and enfeebled, its rulers debauched, effete, and worthless; its people deteriorated physically, morally, and mentally.

These were the circumstances which created an occasion for Mahommed—one of those occasions of which Machiavelli makes mention in his "Prince" as "good opportunities for great men to take advantage of."

Sale dwells a great deal on the sublimity of many portions of the Koran; not only of the style, but of the doctrine; but he passes very lightly over the sources of inspiration of the arch impostor. He tells us, indeed, that "the Persians had, by their vicinity and frequent intercourse with the Arabians, introduced the Magian religion among some of their tribes, particularly that of Tamin, long before Mahommed, who was so far from being unacquainted with that religion, that he borrowed many of his own institutions from it, as will be observed in the progress of this work." . . . "The Jews, who fled in great numbers from Arabia, from the fearful destruction of their country by the Romans, made proselytes of several tribes, those of Henanah, Al Hareth, Ebn Caaba, and Kenda, in particular, and soon became very powerful, and possessed of several towns and fortresses there. But the Jewish religion was not unknown to the Arabs at least above a century before." . . . "Christianity had likewise made great progress among this nation before Mahommed. Whether one of the apostles preached in any part of Arabia, properly so called, is uncertain; but the persecutions and disorders which happened in the Eastern Church soon after the beginning of the third century, obliged great numbers of Christians to seek for shelter in this country of liberty, who, being for the most part of the Jacobite communion, that sect generally prevailed among the Arabs. The principal tribes that embraced Christianity were

Hamyar, Ghassan, Rabia, Taghlab, Bahra, Tonuch, part of the tribes of Tay and Kodàa, the inhabitants of Najran, and the Arabs of Hira." . . . "The Christians at Hira received a great accession, by several tribes who fled thither from the persecution of Dhu Nowas, a king of Yaman, who had embraced Judaism about 700 years before Mahommed."

Since Christianity had made such great progress in Arabia, we may consequently suppose they had bishops in several parts, for the more orderly governing of their churches. A Bishop of Dhafar has been already named, and we are told that Najran was already a bishop's see. The Jacobites (of which sect the Arabs generally were) had two Bishops of the Arabs, subject to the Mafrian, or metropolitan of the East. One was called the Bishop of the Arabs absolutely, whose seat was for the most part at Akula, which some authors make the same with Cufa; others, a different town near Bagdad. The other had the title of Bishop of the Scenite Arabs, of the tribe of Thalaab, in Nira, or Nirta, as the Syrians call it, whose seat was in that city. The Nestorians had but one bishop, who presided over both these dioceses of Nira and Akula, and was immediately subject to their patriarch.* All these tribes and portions of tribes of Christians shared the fate of the idolatrous Arabians, who were put to the sword by the great Reformer; but Sale expresses no sympathy for them, and takes no notice of their destruction beyond the simple record of their existence and disappearance. Neither does he give any particulars of the aid given to the impostor by Christian renegades and heretics in the fabrication of the Koran, beyond what is conveyed in the following passage in the Preliminary discourse, in reference to Mahommed's first disclosures to his wife Khadigah, of the revelations made to him by the angel Gabriel: "Khadigah received the news with great joy, swearing by him in whose hands her soul was, that she trusted he would be the prophet of his

* Sale's Koran. Preliminary Observations. Ed. 1850, pp. 16, 17.

nation: and immediately she communicated it to her cousin, Warakah Ebn Nawfal, who being a Christian, could write in the Hebrew character, and was tolerably well versed in the Scriptures; and he as readily came into her opinion, assuring her that the same angel who had formerly appeared unto Moses, was now sent to Mahommed. The first overture the prophet made was in the mountain of Armadan, in the 40th year of his age, which is therefore usually called the year of his mission."*

We are indebted mainly for Sale's version of the Koran to the Latin translation of it, made by Father Marracci (an eminent Italian ecclesiastic and Oriental scholar, attached to the Court of Rome in the pontificate of Innocent XI.), published in Padua in 1698. This Latin translation was accompanied with the original Arabic text, and most valuable notes, and a refutation of the imposture. Sale availed himself largely of Marracci's translation of the text of the Koran. Lane acknowledges that Sale's translation is mainly taken from Marracci's. But the valuable illustrations of the imposture given by Marracci did not suit Sale to make use of. Speaking of Marracci's labours, however, he is obliged to bear testimony to their value:—"This translation of Marracci's, generally speaking, is very exact; but adheres to the Arabic idiom too literally to be easily understood, unless I am much deceived, by those who are not versed in the Mahommedan learning. The notes he has are indeed of great use; but his refutations, which swell the work to a large volume, are of little or none at all, being often unsatisfactory, and sometimes impertinent. The work, however, with all its faults, is very valuable; and I should be guilty of ingratitude, did I not acknowledge myself much obliged thereto; but still in Latin, it can be of no use to those who understand not that tongue."

But Sale, though he has adopted and given, in his Preliminary Discourse, some of the details of Mahommed's career, that

* Sale's Koran. Prelim. Discourse, p. 30. The first Edition (4to) was published in 1734.

are to be found in Marracci's notes and illustrations, has omitted those things in the latter which were especially worthy of notice, relating to the machinery of the great imposture, the assistance given to the impostor, *the epileptic seizures to which he was subject*, and the numerous inconsistencies, infamous devices, and impious relations of which evidence is to be found in the Koran. The admiration of Sale for the character of Mahommed, and "the sublimity and magnificence" of the style and conception of many parts of the Koran, seem to have entirely obscured his vision, when the deadly hate and mortal injury to Christianity of the arch impostor presented themselves to it, in the fierce denunciation of the doctrine of the Trinity, denial of the Divinity of Christ, and of the death of Christ for the ransom of all mankind, and in the terrible injunctions to Moslems to make exterminating wars on all the followers of Christ and of Moses, as well as the Pagan Arabs who would not conform to the law of Islam. Let us see how these matters are viewed by a disciple of Sale's, Mr. Edward William Lane, in the last English version of a portion of the Koran, entitled "Selections from the Koran, translated from the Koran," small 8vo., 1843). There we find the same fulsome eulogies of the great Arabian Reformer and his wonderful book, the Koran. And in a previous work of the same writer "Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians," in the preface to the first volume we meet the following passage, abundantly illustrative of the estimation in which the divine book of the Moslems is held by the author:—"Having made myself acquainted with all their religious ceremonies, I have been able to escape exciting in strangers any suspicion of being a person who had no right to intrude amongst them, whenever it was necessary for me to witness any Moslem rite or ceremony. While, from the dress which I have found most convenient to wear, I am generally mistaken in public for a Turk: my acquaintances of course know me to be an Englishman: but I constrain them to treat me as a Mooslim, by my freely acknowledging the hand of Providence in the introduction and diffusion of the religion of

El Islam; and when interrogated, avowing my belief in the Messiah in accordance with the words of the Kur-ân, as the Word of God infused into the womb of the Virgin Mary, and a Spirit proceeding from him."

Of this extremely liberal condescendance of Christianity to Mahommedanism much might be said; but another, and preceding passage in the same preface, renders comment unnecessary:—"I have associated almost exclusively with Mooslims of various ranks in society, conforming with their general habits; and in order to make them familiar and unreserved towards me on every subject, have always avowed my agreement with them in opinion, whenever my conscience would allow me; and in most other cases refrained from the expression of my dissent, as well as from every action which might give them disgust."*

Even the tolerant and intelligent Walpole, in his "Travels in the East" (Vol. I., p. 86), finds himself (*malgrè lui*) compelled to cater to the vitiated prevailing taste for the faith of Mahommedans over that of Christians, even, as he describes it in its corrupted state:—"On most points (also says Mr. Walpole), Mussulman commentators have almost superseded the Koran, and as with various sects of Christians, legendary tradition or abstruse explanations have taken the lead of the original revelation. Credit, however, must be given to Mahommed, that he gave a purer, better religion to his followers than the absurd, idolatrous corruption of Christianity they possessed before: Nulla falsa doctrina est quæ non aliquid veri permiscuit."

Of the style and composition of the Koran, Sale thus speaks: "The Arabic language is undoubtedly one of the most ancient in the world, and arose soon after, if not at, the confusion of Babel. There were several dialects of it, very different from each other: the most remarkable were, that spoken by the tribe of Hamyar and the other genuine Arabs, and that of the Koreish. The Hamyaritic seems to have approached nearer to the

* Lane's Selections from the Koran. Translated from the Arabic.

purity of the Syriac than the dialect of any other tribe; for the Arabs acknowledge their father Yarab to have been the first whose tongue deviated from the Syriac (which was his mother-tongue, and is almost generally acknowledged by the Asiatics to be the most ancient) to the Arabic. The dialect of the Koreish is usually termed the pure Arabic, or as the Korân, which is written in this dialect, calls it, the perspicuous and clear Arabic; perhaps, says, Dr. Pococke, because Ishmael, their father, brought the Arabic he had learned of the Jorhamites nearer to the original Hebrew. . . The Arabians tell us that the greater part of their language has been lost; which will not be thought strange, if we consider how late the art of writing was practised among them. For though it was known to Job, their countryman, and also to the Hamyarites (who used a perplexed character called al Mosnad, wherein the letters were not distinctly separate, and which was neither publicly taught, nor suffered to be used without permission first obtained) many centuries before Mahommed, as appears from some ancient monuments, said to be remaining in their character; yet the other Arabs, and those of Mecca in particular, were, for many ages, perfectly ignorant of it, unless such of them as were Jews, or Christians: Morâmer Ebn Morra of Anbar, a city of Irâk, who lived not many years before Mahommed, was the inventor of the Arabic character, which Bashar the Kendian is said to have learned from those of Anbar, and to have introduced at Mecca but a little while before the institution of Mahommedanism. These letters of Morâmer were different from the Hamyaritic; and though they were very rude, being either the same with, or very much like the Cufic, which character is still found in inscriptions and some ancient books, yet they were those which the Arabs used for many years, the Korân itself being at first written therein; for the beautiful character they now use, was first formed from the Cufic by Ebn Moklah, Wazir (or Visir) to the Khalîfs al Moktader, al Kâher, and al Râdi, who lived about 300 years after Mahommed, and was brought to great perfection by Ali

Ebn Bowâb, who flourished in the following century, and whose name is yet famous among them on that account: yet it is said, the person who completed it, and reduced it to its present form, was Yakût al Mostásemi, secretary to al Mostásem, the last of the Khalífs of the family of Abbâs, for which reason he was surnamed al Khattâb, or the scribe." . . "As to acquired learning, it is confessed Mahommed had none at all; having had no other education than what was customary in his tribe, who neglected, and perhaps despised, what we call literature; esteeming no language in comparison with their own, their skill in which they gained by use, and not by books, and contenting themselves with improving their private experience by committing to memory such passages of their poets as they judged might be of use to them in life. This defect was so far from being prejudicial or putting a stop to his design, that he made the greatest use of it; insisting that the writings which he produced as revelations from God, could not possibly be a forgery of his own; because it was not conceivable that a person who could neither write nor read should be able to compose a book of such excellent doctrine, and in so elegant a style; and thereby obviating an objection that might have carried a great deal of weight. And for this reason his followers, instead of being ashamed of their master's ignorance, glory in it, as an evident proof of his Divine mission, and scruple not to call him (as he is indeed called in the Korân itself), the illiterate prophet."*

"Mahommed (says Von Hammer) felt himself called to lead back his countrymen, who were sunk in idolatry, to the knowledge of the only true God, and, as prophet and legislator, to complete the great work of purifying natural religion from the dross of superstition; a task which so many had previously, at different times, attempted. Arabia was divided among the religions of the Christians, the Jews, and the Sabæans. To combine these three into one, by the union of that which flowed

* Sale's Trans. of the Koran, Prelim. Dis.

from principles common to all, for the attainment of political liberty and greatness, was the aim of his life, which had been so long spent in meditation, and only late in years was roused to active exertion. From his infancy, his mother, Emina, who was a Jewess, and in early youth, during a journey in Syria, the Christian monk, Sergius, imbued him with the religious tenets of Moses and Jesus, and exhibited, in the full light of its infamy, the idolatrous worship of the Kaaba, where a hundred idols demanded the adoration of the people.

"The Jews were expecting the Messiah as the Saviour of Israel, the Christians looked for the advent of the Paraclete, as their comforter and mediator, when, in his fortieth year (an age which, in the east, has always been considered as that of a prophet), Mahommed felt within him the voice of Divine inspiration, enjoining him to read in the name of the Lord, the commands of heaven, and by their promulgation, to prove himself to his people, the prophet and apostle of God. Nature had formed him a poet and an enthusiastic orator, by endowing him with an astounding power of language, a penetrating ardour of imagination, a dignity of demeanour, commanding the profoundest reverence, and a captivating suavity of manners. Valour, magnanimity, and eloquence, qualities prized by every nation, and by none more than the wild son of the desert, were the three great magnets which drew him to the hearts of his people, who had long been wont to do homage to the heroic and munificent, and more especially to the great poets, whose noble productions were hung in the Kaaba, written in golden letters, and as the immediate gifts of heaven, deemed worthy of Divine adoration.

"Of all Arabic poetry, the Koran is the master-piece; in it the lightning of sublimity gleams through the dreary obscurity of long prosy traditions and ordinances, and the energetic language rolls like the thunder of heaven, reverberating from rock to rock, in the echo of the rhyme; or pours on like the roaring of the wave, in the constant return of similar sounding words. It stands the glorious pyramid of Arabic poetry; no

poet of this people, either before or since, has approached its excellence."*

Ockley, in his "History of the Saracens," states, that shortly before the murder of Othman, third Caliph after Mahommed, when Othman was threatened with deposition, among the various charges brought against him, one was—"the removal of Amrou Ebn Al Aas from the lieutenancy of Egypt, to make room for Saïd Ebn Abi Sharehh. This Saïd had been one of those who helped to write the Koran, and had afterwards apostatized, and renounced the profession of Mahommedanism. For all which Mahommed had resolved to kill him: when, in the eighth year of the Hejirah, he took Mecca, but had, at Othman's entreaty, spared his life, and was content with simply banishing him."

Dr. Weil says:—"There was another circumstance which prejudiced the people against Othman. In consequence of the multiplied variations which had crept into the readings of the Koran, Othman had caused all the different copies which could be found to be collected together and burnt, excepting one, which alone, sanctioned by his own authority, he directed all believers to receive as the only genuine transcript of the revelations of the prophet. Moreover, he confided the editorship and revision of this new and authentic edition to those who were most devoted to him, rather than to those who were most learned."

The two preceding passages tend to throw a great deal of doubt on the authenticity of the Koran as a genuine production of Mahommed and his scribes, or rather of his auxiliaries.

What are Christians to think of the following opinion of the Koran, gravely expressed by a German Oriental scholar of the first eminence in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, Von Hammer, the author of the celebrated Turkish history?—"Mahommed's lofty destiny, in changing from poet to prophet, has induced many later Arabian poets

* History of the Assassins, by the Chevalier Von Hammer. Trans. from the German by Dr. Wood. 12mo. London, 1835, p. 8.

and beaux esprits to attempt the like; the consequences of which have either been nugatory, or fraught with their own destruction. Moseleima, a cotemporary of Mahommed, and, like him, the poet of nature, nevertheless, soon became dangerous to him, as the unattainable divinity of the Koran had not yet received the sanction of ages. Ibn Mokaffaa, the elegant translator of the fables of Bidpai, who shut himself up for whole weeks, to produce a single verse which might bear a comparison with the lofty passage of the Koran, on the deluge, —'Earth, swallow thy waters! Heaven, withhold thy cataracts!'—earned by his fruitless labours nothing but the reputation of a free-thinker; and Motenebbi, whose name signifies the 'prophecying,' gained, indeed, the glory of a great poet, but never that of a prophet. *Thus, for twelve centuries, the Koran has maintained, undisturbed, the character of an inimitable and uncreated celestial Scripture, as the eternal Word of God.*"

Are these the fitting terms wherein to speak of the impious fabrication of the Arch Impostor? Can the man who uses them or reads them and adopts them for his own, have any just claim to the name or character of a Christian?

Von Hammer can hardly find words sufficiently eulogistic for his notice of the surpassing excellence of the Koran, *and the voice of the Divine inspiration which Mahommed felt within him.* What Von Hammer's notions of Christianity could be when he pronounced in terms glowing with such fervid and eloquent admiration, the following eulogies on an impostor who had deliberately forged and uttered solemn lies on the most sacred of all subjects; made the Almighty God the author and contriver of the egregious fraud astutely planned by him to deceive mankind, and turned that deceit to the account of lust and ambition, it would be indeed difficult to say.

It would seem as if these writers were so blinded by passionate hate against Catholicity, that they could see nothing but a great zeal for reform in the denunciation of the Trinity in the Koran—in the declaration of the superiority of the pro-

phet Mahommed over the prophet Christ—in the denunciation of the Holy Scriptures as they existed then, and as they exist at this day in the Protestant versions (with some differences of small amount), as false gospels, so mutilated and corrupted as to be utterly at variance with the original Scriptures—in the proscription and persecution to the death of all opponents of the Koran, Christians and Jews, as well as pagan Arabs—in continual appeals to all good Moslems, in the name of God and by his orders, to make war on these infidels, and to promulgate the law of Islam by the sword.

It is vain to seek in the writings of Sale or Lane the slightest tincture of sound criticism, when they have to deal with any matter that is calculated to magnify Mahommedanism, and to depress and depreciate Roman Catholic Christianity. What a marvellous difference there is in this respect between the English writings of Sale or Lane, and those of Bayle. If we turn to the article *Mahommed* in the "Historical and Critical Dictionary," we discover indeed traces enough of the Protestantism (of the Socinian order) in the references to Catholicism, and the government of the Church of Rome in the article of Bayle on Mahommed: plenty of invidious comparisons between Catholicism and Protestantism. But we find also in this writer's dealings with Mahommedanism and its founder, a spirit of truth and fairness, ample evidence of critical acumen, of extensive research, of sound judgment, and a strong determination to state facts for or against his opinions, as the case may be. We find in his article on Mahommed many erroneous opinions, many tendencies to sneer and jeer at subjects which all Catholics at least must feel offensive. But in all his researches into this subject of Mahommed, there is no evidence of intention or desire to suppress any facts, to stifle any truths which have come in the way of his enquiry. He has discovered them, and obviously considered it was his duty to record them. Hence, in that article of his on Mahommed, though by no means so elaborate as many other articles in the "Critical and Historical Dictionary," we get more insight into the character and career

of the Arch Impostor, than we do in all the writings concerning him and his impostures of English Protestants, with perhaps a single exception.

And here I feel the expression forced on me of an opinion which has often occurred to me in the course of a pretty long life, full of experience acquired by travel or studious habits:—"That no civilised people in existence hold, and no nation of antiquity, with the exception of that of Rome, ever held truth in such disrespect, when it militates against imperial pride, or a law-established religion, as the English.

The upholding of Protestantism is a more important consideration with them than any other connected with imperial interests. Let the church be supposed to be affected by any enquiry, by any historical references or analogous researches appearing even to bear on them, no matter how high the intelligence may be of the inquirer or commentator, the exercise of the characteristic qualities of his nation, respect for truth, love of justice, and fair play, is suspended. He absolutely shuts out the light of truth; he will not see facts which are not favourable or flattering to his "establishment;" he will not deal impartially with any events in history relating to Catholic nations, sovereigns, or notabilities of any kind; he feels it reconcileable with his notions of justice, in all matters wherein that "establishment" is concerned, to stifle truths and to suppress facts that are favourable to Catholicity or its rulers; nay, to prevaricate, to palliate great crimes and shocking impieties that have been perpetrated by the direst and most implacable enemies of Christianity, provided Catholicity has been grievously hurt through its sides, or been stabbed at without being mortally wounded by them. This is very lamentable; and for the sake of English morality and English honour, most devoutly is it to be prayed that truth, and justice, and fair play may not continue to be made in their historical literature as they now are, and have long been —mere sophisms, solemn mockeries, sounds, signifying things of which nothing but the names remain.

Dean Prideaux, who was certainly far more competent than Gibbon, Sale, or Von Hammer, to form a just estimate of the comparative merits of the Koran and the Scriptures, makes some observations perhaps quite as necessary to be studied carefully in our age, as that in which he wrote, in the treatise appended to his life of Mahommed :—

"A Discourse for the Vindicating of Christianity, offered by way of a letter, for the Consideration of the Deists of the Present Age."* Addressing the apologists and eulogists of the Koran professing to be Christians, but whom the venerable Dean appeals to in their character as Deists, he says :—"If you can find any one lineament of imposture such as that of Mahommed's Koran, any one line of all its filthy features in the whole gospel of Jesus Christ, I dare to say, so sure am I of the contrary, that for the sake hereof I will give you all you contend for, and yield you up the whole. . .

"And when this character, which is thus falsely assumed, is no less than a pretended embassy from heaven, and under the credit of it a new religion is given to the world as coming from God, which is nothing else but a forgery, invented by the first propagators of it, to impose a cheat upon mankind, it amounts to be an imposture in that sense, in which you would have the Gospel of Jesus Christ to be such.

"All that I contend for is, that if Christianity be such an imposture, as we all acknowledge the religion of Mahommed to be, it must be just such another thing as that is, with all the same marks, characters, and properties of an imposture belonging thereto; and that if none of those marks, characters, or properties can be discovered in it, it must be a clear acquittal of the whole charge, and manifestly prove that our holy religion cannot be that thing which you would have it be. For our only way of knowing things, is by their marks and properties; and it is by them only that we can discover what the nature of them is. . . .

* Dean Prideaux's Letter to the Deists, &c., 7th Ed., 8vo., London, 1718.

"Now the marks and characters which I look on to be inseparable from every such imposture, are these following:— 1. That it must always have for its end some carnal interest. 2. That it can have none but wicked men for the authors of it. 3. That both these must necessarily appear in the very contexture of the imposture itself. 4. That it can never be so framed, but that it must contain some palpable falsities, which will discover the falsity of all the rest. 5. That wherever it is first propagated, it must be done by craft and fraud. 6. That when entrusted with many conspirators, it can never be long concealed. And, 7. That it can never be established, unless backed with force and violence. That all these must belong to every imposture, and all particularly did so to Mahommedanism; and that none of them can be charged upon Christianity can easily be shewn.

"That every imposture must have for its end some carnal interest, is a thing so plain and evident, that I suppose it will not need much proof. For to impose a cheat upon mankind, and in a matter of that great moment, it must be taken for granted there is an end proposed, which, in the estimation of the venturer, is equivalent thereto. What it was that put Mahommed on his imposture, the foregoing history of his life sufficiently shows; it was his ambition and his lust. . .

"But here we challenge all the enemies of that holy religion which we profess, to find out anything like this in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, anything that savours of worldly interest, either in him the first founder of our faith, or in any of his holy apostles, who were the first propagators of it. Vaninus, one of the most zealous champions of impiety that ever appeared against the Christian cause (for he died a martyr for it) hath attempted this; but after the most accurate and diligent search which so keen an adversary could make, he was forced to give up the point, and plainly acknowledge, that in the whole series of the history and actions of our Saviour, he could not find anything that he could charge with secular interest or design to blast him or his religion with. . . .

"Had our Saviour, when he took upon him to be the Messias, done it only as an impostor, for a secular interest, he would have assumed that character according to those notions in which the Jews expected him, because this would have been the readiest and most likely way for him to carry that interest, whatever you may suppose it to be. For the eager expectations of that people being then for such a reigning Messias, as they had drawn a picture of in their own fancies, his only way to have gotten them to own and receive him for the Messias, was for him exactly to have humoured them herein, and proposed himself to them just such a one as they would have had him to be. . . .

"Had his business only been to deceive the people for the advancing of some secular interest of his own, he would never have attempted it in so unlikely a way of succeeding, as that of abolishing the Mosaical Law, to which the whole nation of the Jews were then so zealously addicted, that they could not bear the least word which might seem to derogate either from the excellency which they conceived of it, or that opinion which they then had, and still retain, that it was to be immutably observed by them to the end of the world. The case of Mahommed with his men of Mecca was quite otherwise, he found no such zeal in them for their old religion to struggle with; they themselves were then grown so weary of it, that the generality of them had in a manner totally exchanged it for no religion at all, at the time that Mahommed first began to propagate his imposture among them; they having then for the most part given themselves up to the opinions of the Zendikees, who in the same manner as the Epicureans among the Greeks, and too many now-a-days among us, acknowledged the being of a God, but denying his Providence, the immortality of the soul, and a future state, did at the same time deny all manner of necessity of paying any worship unto him. . . .

"The grand and fundamental doctrine of the religion which Jesus Christ left his Church, was that of his death and passion, whereby he made atonement for our sins, and delivered us from

the punishment which was due unto us for them. By this means only he proposed to save us, that is, from sin, the devil, and eternal death; and by this conflict only did he undertake to subdue these our enemies for us, and on that conquest to found us a kingdom, which should make us holy and righteous here, and for ever blessed with him in glory hereafter. This was the whole end and purpose of our Saviour's mission; this he frequently foretold to his disciples, and on this was founded the whole religion which he taught them. And can any one say he could have a design of secular interest for himself in such a religion as this, which could have no being but by his dying for it, or any reason for its establishment among men, till he had laid down his life for the completing of it?"

PASSAGES FROM THE KORAN,

Extracted from Sale's Translation.

The following passages are given in the precise words of that literal version, without note or comment, with a view of affording illustrations of the manifold contradictions, forgeries, and impious pretensions, that abound in that volume: violations of morals in the impostor's revelations of a sanction given by God to his sensuality, to his savagery and rapacity in his wars with his opponents, and to all the sanguinary teachings of his religion; and, lastly, with a view of giving plain, manifest, unmistakable evidence of the deadly hostility of the Arch impostor to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The necessity that exists for these illustrations of the true spirit of the Koran must be obvious to every one who bears in mind that the Koran is the foundation of all law, policy, state rule, and social *regime*, in the Turkish Empire. That it is the same to-day, as it was in the beginning of Mahommedanism—a sanguinary sensual code, essentially anti-christian.

"The Koran (says Sale) being the Mahommedans' rule of faith and practice, it is no wonder its expositors and commentators are so numerous."—*Preliminary Discourse.*

The Koran (says Lane) is a code of ritual, moral, and criminal law, as well as a rule of faith.*

EXTRACTS FROM AL KORAN.

FROM CHAPTER II.

"There is no doubt in this book; it is a direction to the pious, who believe in the mysteries of faith, who observe the appointed times of prayer, and distribute alms out of what we have bestowed on them: and who believe in that revelation, which hath been sent down unto thee, and that which hath been sent down unto the prophets before thee, and have firm assurance of the life to come: these are directed by their Lord and they shall prosper. As for the unbelievers, it will be equal to them whether thou admonish them or do not admonish them; they will not believe. God hath sealed up their hearts and their hearing; a dimness covereth their sight, and they shall suffer a grievous punishment. . .

"It is not the desire of the unbelievers, either among those unto whom the Scriptures have been given, or among the idolators, that any good should be sent down unto you from your Lord: but God will appropriate his mercy unto whom he pleaseth, for God is exceeding beneficent. Whatever verse we shall abrogate, or cause thee to forget, we will bring a better than it, or one like unto it. Dost thou not know that God is almighty? Dost thou not know that unto God belongeth the kingdom of heaven and earth? neither have ye any protector or helper except God. . .

"They say, Become Jews or Christians, that ye may be directed. Say, Nay, we foHow the religion of Abraham the orthodox, who was no idolator. Say, We believe in God, and that which hath been sent down unto us, and that which hath been sent unto Abraham and Ishmael, and Isaac and Jacob, and the tribes; and that which was delivered unto Moses, and Jesus, and that which was delivered unto the prophets from their

* Lane's Selections from the Koran.

Lord: we make no distinction between any of them, and to God are we resigned. Now, if they believe according to what ye believe, they are surely directed; but, if they turn back, they are in schism. . .

"O true believers, the law of retaliation is ordained you for the slain: the free shall die for the free, the servant for the servant, and a woman for a woman; but he whom his brother shall forgive may be prosecuted, and obliged to make satisfaction according to what is just, and a fine shall be set on him with humanity. This is indulgence from your Lord, and mercy. And he who shall transgress after this, by killing the murderer, shall suffer a grievous punishment. And in this law of retaliation ye have life, O ye of understanding! that peradventure ye may fear. . .

"And fight for the religion of God against those who fight against you; but transgress not by attacking them first, for God loveth not the transgressors. And kill them wherever ye find them, and turn them out of that whereof they have dispossessed you; for temptation to idolatry is more grievous than slaughter: yet fight not against them in the holy temple, until they attack you therein; but if they attack you, slay them there. This shall be the reward of the infidels. But if they desist, God is gracious and merciful. Fight therefore against them, until there be no temptation to idolatry, and the religion be God's: but if they desist let there be no hostility, except against the ungodly. A sacred month for a sacred month, and the holy limits of Mecca, if they attack you therein, do ye also attack them therein in retaliation; and whoever transgresseth against you by so doing, do ye transgress against him in like manner as he hath transgressed against you, and fear God, and know that God is with those who fear him. . .

"War is injoined against the infidels; but this is hateful unto you: yet perchance ye hate a thing which is better for you, and perchance ye love a thing which is worse for you; but God knoweth, and ye know not. . .

"The women ought also to behave towards their husbands

in like manner as their husbands should behave towards them, according to what is just: but the men ought to have a superiority over them. God is mighty and wise. Ye may divorce your wives twice; and then either retain them with humanity, or dismiss them with kindness. . .

"But if the husband divorce her a third time, she shall not be lawful for him again, until she marry another husband. But if he also divorce her, it shall be no crime in them if they return to each other, if they think they can observe the ordinances of God; and these are the ordinances of God, he declareth them to people of understanding. . .

"Fight for the religion of God, and know that God is he who heareth and knoweth. . .

"These are the apostles; we have preferred some of them before others; some of them hath God spoken unto, and hath exalted the degree of others of them. And we gave unto Jesus, the son of Mary, manifest signs, and strengthened him with the holy spirit."

FROM CHAPTER III.

"Verily, the true religion, in the sight of God, is Islam; and they who had received the Scriptures dissented not therefrom, until after the knowledge of God's unity had come to them, out of envy among themselves; but whosoever believeth not in the signs of God, verily, God will be swift in bringing him to account. If they dispute with thee, say, I have resigned myself unto God, and he who followeth me doth the same: and say to them who have received the Scriptures, and to the ignorant, Do ye profess the religion of Islam? Now, if they embrace Islam, they are surely directed; but if they turn their backs, verily, unto thee belongeth preaching only, for God regardeth his servants. And unto those who believe not in the signs of God, and slay the prophets without a cause, and put those men to death who teach justice; denounce unto them a painful punishment. . .

"Remember the wife of Imram said, 'Lord, verily I have vowed unto thee that which is in my womb, to be dedicated to

thy service: accept it, therefore, of me, for thou art he who heareth and knoweth.' And when she was delivered of it, she said, 'Lord, verily I have brought forth a female (and God well knew what she had brought forth), and a male is not as a female; I have called her Mary, and I commend her to thy protection, and also her issue, against Satan, driven away with stones.' Therefore the Lord accepted her with a gracious acceptance, and caused her to bear an excellent offspring. And Zacharias took care of the child. Whenever Zacharias went into the chamber to her, he found provisions with her, and he said, 'O, Mary, whence hadst thou this?' She answered, 'This is from God, for God provideth for whom he pleaseth without measure.' There Zacharias called on his Lord, and said, 'Lord, give me from thee a good offspring, for thou art the hearer of prayer.' And the angels called to him while he stood praying in the chamber, saying, 'Verily, God promiseth thee a son named John, who shall bear witness to the word which cometh from God, an honourable person, chaste, and one of the righteous prophets.' He answered, 'Lord, how shall I have a son, when old age hath overtaken me, and my wife is barren?' The angel said, 'So God doth that which he pleaseth.' Zacharias answered, 'Lord, give me a sign.' The angel said, 'Thy sign shall be, that thou shalt speak to no man for three days, otherwise than by gesture; remember thy Lord often, and praise him evening and morning.' And then the angels said, 'O, Mary, verily God hath chosen thee, and hath purified thee, and hath chosen thee above all the women of the world. O, Mary, be devout towards thy Lord, and worship and bow down with those who bow down. This is a secret history, we reveal it unto thee, although thou wast not present with them when they threw in their rods to cast lots which of them should have the education of Mary; neither wast thou with them when they strove among themselves.' When the angels said, 'O, Mary, verily God sendeth thee good tidings, that thou shalt bear the word, proceeding from himself; his name shall be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, honourable in this world, and in the world to

come, and one of those who approach near to the presence of God; and he shall speak unto men in the cradle, and when he is grown up, and he shall be one of the righteous.' She answered, 'Lord, how shall I have a son, since a man has not touched me?' . .

"Verily the likeness of Jesus, in the sight of God, is as the likeness of Adam; he created him out of the dust, and then said unto him, 'Be,' and he was. This is the truth from thy Lord; be not, therefore, one of those who doubt; and whoever shall dispute with thee concerning him, after the knowledge which hath been given thee, say unto them, 'Come, let us call together our sons and your sons, and our wives and your wives, and ourselves and yourselves; then let us make imprecations, and lay the curse of God on those who lie.'" . .

"Whoever followeth any other religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him; and in the next life he shall be one of those who perish. . .

"Moreover ye did sometime wish for death before that ye met it; but ye have now seen it and ye looked on, but retreated from it. Mahommed is no more than an apostle; the other apostles have already deceased before him; if he die, therefore, or be slain, will ye turn back on your heels? But he who turneth back on his heels, will not hurt God at all; and God will surely reward the thankful. No soul can die unless by the permission of God, according to what is written in the book containing the determinations of things."

FROM CHAPTER IV.

"And if ye fear that ye shall not act with equity towards orphans of the female sex, take in marriage of such other women as please you, two, or three, or four, and not more. But if ye fear that ye cannot act equitably towards so many, marry one only, or the slaves which ye shall have acquired. . .

"Men shall have the pre-eminence above women, because of those advantages wherein God hath caused the one of them to excel the other, and for that which they expend of their substance in maintaining their wives. The honest women are

obedient, careful in the absence of their husbands, for that God, preserveth them by committing them to the care and protection of the men. But those whose perverseness ye shall be apprehensive of, rebuke; and remove them into separate apartments, and chastise them. . .

"Thou shalt surely find the most violent of all men in enmity against the true believers, to be the Jews, and the idolaters; and thou shalt surely find those among them to be the most inclinable to entertain friendship for the true believers, who say, we are Christians. This cometh to pass, because there are priests and monks among them: and because they are not elated with pride. And when they hear that which hath been sent down to the apostles read unto them, thou shalt see their eyes overflow with tears, because of the truth which they shall perceive therein, saying, O Lord, we believe; write us down, therefore, with those who bear witness to truth, and what should hinder us from believing in God, and the truth which hath come unto us, and from earnestly desiring that our Lord would introduce us into paradise with the righteous people? Therefore hath God rewarded them, for what they have said, with gardens through which rivers flow; they shall continue therein for ever; and this is the reward of the righteous. But they who believe not, and accuse our signs of falsehood, they shall be the companions of hell. . .

"On a certain day shall God assemble the apostles, and shall say unto them, 'What answer was returned you, when ye preached unto the people to whom ye were sent?' They shall answer, 'We have no knowledge, but thou art the knower of secrets.' When God shall say, 'O Jesus, son of Mary! remember my favour towards thee, and towards thy mother; when I strengthened thee with the Holy Spirit, that thou shouldest speak unto men in the cradle, and when thou wast grown up; and when I taught thee the Scripture, and wisdom, and the law, and the gospel; and when thou didst create of clay, as it were, the figure of a bird, by my permission, and didst breathe thereon, and it became a bird by my permission;

and thou didst heal one blind from his birth, and the leper, by my permission; and when thou didst bring forth the dead from their graves, by my permission; and when I withheld the children of Israel from killing thee, when thou hadst come unto them with evident miracles; and such of them as believed not, said, this is nothing but manifest sorcery. And when I commanded the apostles of Jesus, saying, believe in me and in my messenger; they answered, we do believe; and do thou bear witness that ye are resigned unto thee. Remember, when the apostles said, O Jesus, son of Mary! is thy Lord able to cause a table to descend unto us from heaven? He answered, fear God, if ye are true believers. They said, we desire to eat thereof and that our hearts may rest at ease: and that we may know that thou hast told us the truth; and that we may be witnesses thereof.' Jesus, the son of Mary, said, O God our Lord! cause a table to descend unto us from heaven, that the day of its descent may become a festival-day, unto us, unto the first of us, and unto the last of us; and a sign from thee; and do thou provide food for us, for thou art the best provider. God said, verily I will cause it to descend unto you; but, whoever among you shall disbelieve hereafter, I will surely punish him with a punishment wherewith I will not punish any other creature. And when God shall say unto Jesus, at the last day, O Jesus, son of Mary! hast thou said unto men, take me, and my mother, for two gods, beside God? He shall answer, praise be unto thee! it is not for me to say that which I ought not; if I had said so, thou wouldest surely have known it; thou knowest what is in me, but I know not what is in thee; for thou art the knower of secrets. I have not spoken to them any other than what thou didst command me; namely, worship God, my Lord and your Lord: and I was a witness of their actions while I stayed among them; but since thou hast taken me to thyself, thou hast been the watcher over them; for thou art witness of all things." . .

FROM CHAPTER VI.

"They make not a due estimation of God, when they say

God hath not sent down unto man anything at all: say, who sent down the book which Moses brought, a light and a direction unto men; which ye transcribe on papers, whereof ye publish some part, and great part whereof ye conceal? and ye have been taught by Mahommed what ye knew not, neither your fathers. Say, God sent it down: then leave them to amuse themselves with their vain discourse. This book, which we have sent down, is blessed: confirming that which was revealed before it: and it is delivered unto thee, that thou mayest preach in unto the metropolis of Mecca, and to those who are round about it. And they who believe in the next life, will believe therein, and they will diligently observe their times of prayer. Who is more wicked than he who forgeth a lie concerning God: or saith, this was revealed unto me; when nothing hath been revealed unto him? and who saith, I will produce a revelation like unto that which God hath sent down?

"We gave also unto Moses the book of the law; a perfect rule unto him who should do right, and a determination concerning all things needful, and a direction, and mercy; that the children of Israel might believe the meeting of their Lord. And this book which we have now sent down is blessed; therefore follow it, and fear God, that ye may obtain mercy: lest ye should say, the Scriptures were only sent down unto two people before us; and we neglected to peruse them with attention: or lest ye should say, if a book of divine revelations had been sent down unto us, we would surely have been better directed than they." . .

FROM CHAPTER VII.

"A book hath been sent down unto thee; and therefore let there be no doubt in thy breast concerning it: that thou mayest preach the same, and that it may be an admonition unto the faithful. Follow that which hath been sent down unto you from your Lord; and follow no guides beside him; how little will ye be warned! How many cities have we destroyed, which our vengeance overtook by night, or while they were reposing themselves at noon-day. . .

"And those who believe on him, and honour him, and assist him, and follow the light which hath been sent down with him, shall be happy. Say, O men! verily I am the messenger of God unto you all, unto him belongeth the kingdom of heaven and earth; there is no God but he; he giveth life, and he causeth to die. Believe, therefore, in God and his apostle, the illiterate prophet, who believeth in God and his word; and follow him, that ye may be rightly directed.

"Verily those who disbelieve our signs, we will surely cast to be broiled in hell-fire; so often as their skins shall be well burned, we will give them other skins in exchange, that they may taste the sharper torment: for God is mighty and wise. . .

"Let them, therefore, fight for the religion of God, who part with the present life in exchange for that which is to come; for whosoever fighteth for the religion of God, whether he be slain or be victorious, we will surely give him a great reward. And what ails you, that ye fight not for God's true religion, and in defence of the weak among men, women, and children? who say, O Lord! bring us forth from this city, whose inhabitants are wicked; grant us from before thee a protector, and grant us from before thee a defender. They who believe, fight for the religion of God; but they who believe not fight for the religion of Taghut. Fight, therefore, against the friends of Satan, for the stratagem of Satan is weak. . .

"Do they not attentively consider the Koran? If it had been from any other besides God, they would certainly have found therein many contradictions.

"Why are ye divided concerning the ungodly into two parties; since God hath overturned them for what they have committed? Will ye direct him whom God hath led astray; since for him whom God shall lead astray thou shalt find no true path? They desire that ye should become infidels, as they are infidels, and that ye should be equally wicked with themselves. Therefore take not friends from among them, until they fly their country for the religion of God: and if they

turn back from the faith, take them, and kill them wherever ye find them: and take no friend from among them, nor any helper, except those who go unto a people who are in alliance with you, or those who come unto you, their hearts forbidding them either to fight against you, or to fight against their own people. And, if God pleased, he would have permitted them to have prevailed against you, and they would have fought against you. But, if they depart from you, and fight not against you, and offer you peace, God doth not allow you to take or kill them. . .

"O ye, who have received the Scriptures! exceed not the just bounds in your religion, neither say of God any other than the truth. Verily Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, is the apostle of God, and his word which he conveyed into Mary, and a spirit proceeding from him. Believe, therefore, in God and his apostles, and say not there are three Gods: forbear this; it will be better for you. God is but one God. Far be it from him that he should have a son; unto him belongeth whatsoever is in heaven and on earth; and God is a sufficient protector."

FROM CHAPTER V.

"O ye who have received the Scriptures! now is our apostle come unto you, to make manifest unto you many things which ye concealed in the Scriptures; and to pass over many things. Now is light and a perspicuous book of revelations come unto you from God. Thereby will God direct him who shall follow his good pleasure into the paths of peace; and shall lead them out of darkness into light, by his will, and shall direct them in the right way. They are infidels, who say, Verily God is Christ, the son of Mary. Say unto them, And who could obtain anything from God to the contrary, if he pleased to destroy Christ, the son of Mary, and his mother, and all those who are on the earth? For unto God belongeth the kingdom of heaven and earth, and whatsoever is contained between them; he createth what he pleaseth, and God is almighty. . .

"Our apostles formerly came unto them, with evident miracles; then were many of them, after this, transgressors on the

earth. But the recompense of those who fight against God and his apostle, and study to act corruptly in the earth, shall be, that they shall be slain or crucified, or have their hands and their feet cut off on the opposite sides, or be banished the land. This shall be their disgrace in this world; and in the next world they shall suffer a grievous punishment: except those who shall repent, before ye prevail against them; for know that God is inclined to forgive, and be merciful. O true believers! fear God, and earnestly desire a near conjunction with him, and fight for his religion, that ye may be happy. . .

"We also caused Jesus, the son of Mary, to follow the footsteps of the prophets, confirming the law which was sent down before him; and we gave him the gospel, containing direction and light; confirming also the law which was given before it, and a direction and admonition unto those who fear God: that they who have received the gospel, might judge according to what God hath revealed therein: And whoso judgeth not according to what God hath revealed, they are transgressors. We have also sent down unto thee the book of the Koran with truth, confirming that Scripture which was revealed before it; and preserving the same safe from corruption. . .

"O true believers! take not the Jews or Christians for your friends; they are friends the one to the other; but whoso among you taketh them for his friends, he is surely one of them: verily, God directeth not unjust people. . .

"O true believers! take not such of those to whom the Scriptures were delivered before you, or of the infidels, for your friends, who make a laughing-stock and a jest of your religion; but fear God, if ye be true believers! nor those who, when ye call to prayer make a laughing-stock and a jest of it: this they do, because they are people who do not understand. . .

"Moreover, if they, who have received the Scriptures, believe and fear God, we will surely expiate their offences from them, and we will lead them into gardens of pleasure; and if they observe the law, and the gospel, and the other Scriptures, which have been sent down unto them from their Lord, they

shall surely eat of good things, both from above them and from under their feet. . .

"Verily, they who believe, and those who judaize, and the Sabians, and the Christians, whoever of them believeth in God and the last day, and doth that which is right, there shall come no fear on them, neither shall they be grieved. . .

"They are surely infidels, who say, Verily, God is Christ, the son of Mary; since Christ said, O children of Israel! serve God, my Lord, and your Lord: whoever shall give a companion unto God, God shall exclude him from paradise, and his habitation shall be hell-fire; and the ungodly shall have none to help them. They are certainly infidels, who say, God is the third of three: for there is no God, besides one God: and if they refrain not from what they say, a painful torment shall surely be inflicted on such of them as are believers. Will they not, therefore be turned unto God, and ask pardon of him? since God is gracious and merciful. Christ, the son of Mary, is no more than an apostle; other apostles have preceded him; and his mother was a woman of veracity; they both ate food. Behold, how we declare unto them the signs of God's unity; and then, behold, how they turn aside from the truth." . .

FROM CHAPTER VIII.

"Say unto the unbelievers, that if they desist from opposing thee, what is already past shall be forgiven them; but if they return to attack thee, the exemplary punishment of the former opposers of the prophets is already past, and the like shall be inflicted on them. Therefore fight against them, until there be no opposition in favour of idolatry, and the religion be wholly God's. If they desist, verily God seeth that which they do; but if they turn back, know that God is your patron; he is the best patron and the best helper. And know that whenever ye gain any spoils, a fifth part thereof belongeth unto God, and to the apostle and his kindred, and the orphans and the poor, and the traveller. . .

"O, true believers, when ye meet a party of the infidels, stand firm and remember God frequently, that ye may prosper,

and obey God and his apostle, and be not refractory, lest ye be discouraged, and your success depart from you; but persevere with patience, for God is with those who persevere. . .

"Verily, the worst cattle in the sight of God are those who are obstinate infidels, and will not believe. As to those who enter into a league with thee, and afterwards violate their league at every convenient opportunity, and fear not God, if thou take them in war, disperse, by making them an example, those who shall come after them that they may be warned; or, if thou apprehend treachery from any people, throw back their league unto them, with like treatment; for God loveth not the treacherous. And think not that the unbelievers have escaped God's vengeance, for they shall not weaken the power of God. Therefore prepare against them what force ye are able, and troops of horse, whereby ye may strike a terror into the enemy of God and your enemy, and into other infidels besides them, whom ye know not, but God knoweth them. . .

"O, prophet! stir up the faithful to war; if twenty of you persevere with constancy, they shall overcome two hundred; and if there be a hundred of you, they shall overcome a thousand of those who believe not; because they are a people which do not understand. Now hath God eased you, for he knew that ye were weak. If there be a hundred of you who persevere with constancy, they shall overcome two hundred; and if there be a thousand of you, they shall overcome two thousand, by the permission of God, for God is with those who persevere. It hath not been granted unto any prophet, that he should possess captives, until he had made a great slaughter of the infidels in the earth."

FROM CHAPTER IX.

"Except such of the idolators with whom ye shall have entered into a league, and who, afterwards, shall not fail you in any instance, nor assist any other against you. Wherefore, perform the covenant which ye shall have made with them, until their time shall be elapsed; for God loveth those who fear him. And when the months wherein ye are not allowed to

attack them shall be passed, kill the idolaters wheresoever ye shall find them, and take them prisoners, and besiege them, and lay wait for them in every convenient place. But if they shall repent, and observe the appointed times of prayer, and pay the legal alms, dismiss them freely, for God is gracious and merciful, and if any of the idolaters shall demand protection of thee, grant him protection, that he may hear the word of God; and afterwards let him reach the place of his security. . .

"O, true believers, verily the idolators are unclean, let them not, therefore, come near unto the holy temple after this year. And if ye fear want, by the cutting off trade and communication with them, God will enrich you of his abundance, if he pleaseth, for God is knowing and wise. Fight against them who believe not in God, nor in the last day, and forbid not that which God and his apostle have forbidden, and profess not the true religion, of those unto whom the Scriptures have been delivered, until they pay tribute by right of subjection, and they be reduced low. The Jews say, Ezra is the son of God; and the Christians say, Christ is the son of God. This is their saying in their mouths, they imitate the saying of those who were unbelievers in former times. May God resist them. How are they infatuated? They take their priests and their monks for their lords, besides God, and Christ the son of Mary; although they are commanded to worship one God only: there is no God but he. Far be that from him which they associate with him! They seek to extinguish the light of God with their mouths; but God willeth no other than to perfect his light, although the infidels be averse. . .

"O, true believers, what aileth you, that when it was said unto you, 'Go forth to fight for the religion of God,' ye inclined heavily unto the earth? Do ye prefer the present life to that which is to come? but the provision of this life in respect of that which is to come, is but slender. Unless ye go forth when ye are summoned to war, God will punish you with a grievous punishment, and he will place another people in your stead,

and ye shall not hurt him at all, for God is Almighty. If ye assist not the prophet, verily God will assist him, as he assisted him formerly, when the unbelievers drove him out of Mecca, the second of two; when they were both in the cave, when he said unto his companion, 'Be not grieved, for God is with us.' And God sent down his security upon him, and strengthened him with armies of angels, whom ye saw not. And he made the word of those who believed not to be abased, and the word of God was exalted; for God is mighty and wise. Go forth to battle, both light and heavy, and employ your substance, and your persons, for the advancement of God's religion. . .

"Verily, God hath purchased of the true believers their souls, and their substance, promising them the enjoyment of Paradise; on condition that they fight for the cause of God; whether they slay or be slain, the promise for the same is assuredly due by the law, and the Gospel, and the Koran. . .

"O, true believers, wage war against such of the infidels as are near you, and let them find severity in you; and know that God is with those who fear him."

FROM CHAPTER X.

"These are the signs of the wise book. It is a strange thing unto the men of Mecca, that we have revealed our will unto a man from among them, saying, 'Denounce threats unto men if they believe not, and bear good tidings unto those who believe, that on the merit of their sincerity they have an interest with their Lord.' The unbelievers say, 'This is manifest sorcery.' . .

"This Koran could not have been composed by any except God! but it is a confirmation of that which was revealed before it, and an explanation of the Scripture; there is no doubt thereof; sent down from the Lord of all creatures. Will they say, Mohammed hath forged it? Answer, bring therefore a chapter like unto it; and call whom ye may to your assistance, besides God, if ye speak truth.

"Unto every nation is a fixed term decreed; when their

term therefore is expired, they shall not have respite for an hour, neither shall their punishment be anticipated."

FROM CHAPTER XI.

"Will they say, he hath forged the Koran? Answer, bring therefore ten chapters like unto it, forged by yourselves; and call on whomsoever ye may to assist you, except God, if ye speak truth. But if they whom ye call to your assistance hear you not; know that this book hath been revealed by the knowledge of God only, and that there is no God but he."

"The infidels say, unless a sign be sent down unto him from his Lord, we will not believe. Thou art commissioned to be a preacher only, and not a worker of miracles: and unto every people hath a director been appointed. God knoweth what every female beareth in her womb; and what wombs want or exceed of their due time, or number of young."

FROM CHAPTER XV.

"We have surely sent down the Koran; and we will certainly preserve the same from corruption. We have heretofore sent apostles before thee: among the ancient sects: and there came no apostle unto them, but they laughed him to scorn."

"We have not sent any before thee, as our apostles, other than men, unto whom we spake by revelation. Inquire therefore of those who have the custody of the Scriptures, if ye know not this to be truth. We sent them with evident miracles, and written revelations; and we have sent unto thee this Koran, that thou mayest declare unto mankind that which hath been sent down unto them, and that they may consider."

"When we substitute in the Koran an abrogating verse in lieu of a verse abrogated (and God best knoweth the fitness of that which he revealeth), the infidels say, thou art only a forger of these verses: but the greater part of them know not truth from falsehood. Say, the Holy Spirit hath brought the same down from thy Lord with truth; that he may confirm those who believe, and for a direction and good tidings unto the Moslems. We also know that they say, verily, a certain man teacheth him to compose the Koran. The tongue of the person

unto whom they incline, is a foreign tongue; but this, wherein the Koran is written, is the perspicuous Arabic tongue."

FROM CHAPTER XVII.

"Say, verily, if men and genii were purposely assembled, that they might produce a book like this Koran, they could not produce one like unto it, although the one of them assisted the other. And we have variously propounded unto men in this Koran, every kind of figurative argument; but the greater part of men refuse to receive it, merely out of infidelity. And they say, we will by no means believe on thee, until thou cause a spring of water to gush forth for us out of the earth; or thou have a garden of palm-trees and vines, and thou cause rivers to spring forth from the midst thereof in abundance; or thou cause the heaven to fall down upon us, as thou hast given out, in pieces; or thou bring down God and the angels to vouch for thee; or thou have a house of gold; or thou ascend by a ladder to heaven; neither will we believe thee ascending thither alone, until thou cause a book to descend unto us, bearing witness of thee, which we may read. Answer, My Lord be praised! Am I other than a man, sent as an apostle? Answer, if the angels had walked on earth as familiar inhabitants thereof, we had surely sent down unto them from heaven an angel for our apostle. Say, God is a sufficient witness between me and you, for he knoweth and regardeth his servants."

FROM CHAPTER XVIII.

"We have surely prepared for the unjust hell-fire, the flame and smoke whereof shall surround them like a pavilion: and if they beg relief, they shall be received with water like molten brass, which shall scald their faces: O how miserable a potion, and how unhappy a couch! As to those who believe, and do good works, we will not suffer the reward of him who shall work righteousness to perish: for them are prepared gardens of eternal abode, which shall be watered by rivers; they shall be adorned therein with bracelets of gold, and shall be clothed in green garments of fine silk and brocades: reposing themselves

therein on thrones. O how happy a reward, and how easy a couch."

FROM CHAPTER XIX.

"And remember in the book of the Koran the story of Mary; when she retired from her family to a place towards the east, and took a veil to conceal herself from them; and we sent our spirit Gabriel unto her, and he appeared unto her in the shape of a perfect man; she said, I fly for refuge unto the merciful God, that he may defend me from thee: if thou fearest him, thou wilt not approach me. He answered, verily I am the messenger of thy Lord, and am sent to give thee a holy son. She said, how shall I have a son, seeing a man hath not touched me, and I am no harlot? Gabriel replied, so shall it be; thy Lord saith, this is easy with me; and we will perform it, that we may ordain him for a sign unto men, and a mercy from us: for it is a thing which is decreed. Wherefore she conceived him: and she retired aside with him in her womb to a distant place; and the pains of childbirth came upon her near the trunk of a palm-tree. She said, would to God I had died before this, and had become a thing forgotten, and lost in oblivion! And he who was beneath her called to her, saying, be not grieved; now hath God provided a rivulet under thee; and do thou shake the body of the palm-tree, and it shall let fall ripe dates upon thee, ready gathered. And eat, and drink, and calm thy mind. Moreover, if thou see any man, and he question thee, say, verily I have vowed a fast unto the Merciful; wherefore I will by no means speak to a man this day. So she brought the child to her people, carrying him in her arms. And they said unto her, O Mary, now hast thou done a strange thing. O sister of Aaron, thy father was not a bad man, neither was thy mother a harlot. But she made signs unto the child to answer them; and they said, how shall we speak to him who is an infant in the cradle? Whereupon the child said, verily I am the servant of God; he hath given me the book of the gospel, and hath appointed me a prophet. And he hath made me blessed, wheresoever I shall be; and hath commanded me to

observe prayer, and to give alms, so long as I shall live; and he hath made me dutiful towards my mother, and hath not made me proud, or unhappy. And peace be on me the day whereon I was born, and the day whereon I shall die, and the day whereon I shall be raised to life. This was Jesus, the son of Mary; the Word of truth, concerning whom they doubt. It is not meet for God, that he should have any son: God forbid! When he decreeth a thing, he only saith unto it, be; and it is. And verily God is my Lord, and your Lord; wherefore serve him; this is the right way. Yet the sectaries differ among themselves concerning Jesus; but woe be unto those who are unbelievers, because of their appearance at the great day.

"They say, The Merciful hath begotten issue. Now have ye uttered an impious thing: it wanteth little but that on occasion thereof the heavens be rent, and the earth cleave in sunder, and the mountains be overthrown and fall, for that they attribute children unto the Merciful; whereas it becometh not God to beget children."

FROM CHAPTER XXI.

"And remember her (Mary) who preserved her virginity, and into whom we breathed our spirit; ordaining her and her son for a sign unto all creatures. Verily, this your religion is one religion, and I am your Lord; wherefore serve me. But the Jews and Christians have made schism in the affair of their religion among themselves: but all of them shall appear before us."

FROM CHAPTER XXII.

"As to the true believers, and they who judaize, and the Sabians, and the Christians, and the Magians, and the idolators; verily God shall judge between them on the day of resurrection; for God is witness of all things. . .

"These are the two opposite parties, who dispute concerning their Lord. And they who believe not, shall have garments of fire fitted unto them: boiling water shall be poured on their heads; their bowels shall be dissolved thereby, and also their

skins; and they shall be beaten with maces of iron. So often as they shall endeavour to get out of hell, because of the anguish of their torments, they shall be dragged back into the same; and their tormentors shall say unto them, 'Taste ye the pain of burning.' God will introduce those who shall believe, and act righteously, into gardens through which rivers flow: they shall be adorned therein with bracelets of gold, and pearls; and their vestures therein shall be silk. . .

"O true believers, bow down, and prostrate yourselves, and worship your Lord; and work righteousness, that ye may be happy: and fight in defence of God's true religion, as it behoveth you to fight for the same. He hath chosen you, and hath not imposed on you any difficulty in the religion which he hath given you, the religion of your father Abraham. He hath named you Moslems heretofore, and in this book; that our apostle may be a witness against you at the day of judgment, and that ye may be witnesses against the rest of mankind."

FROM CHAPTER XXIII.

"Now are the true believers happy; who humble themselves in their prayer, and who eschew all vain discourse, and who are doers of alms-deeds: and who keep themselves from carnal knowlege of any woman except their wives, or the captives which their right hands possess; (for as to them they shall be blameless: but whoever coveteth any woman beyond these, they are transgressors:) and who acquit themselves faithfully of their trust, and justly perform their covenant; and who observe their appointed times of prayer: these shall be the heirs who shall inherit paradise; they shall continue therein for ever. . .

"And we appointed the son of Mary, and his mother, for a sign: and we prepared an abode for them in an elevated part of the earth, being a place of quiet and security, and watered with running springs."

FROM CHAPTER XXV.

"And the unbelievers say, 'This Koran is no other than a forgery which he hath contrived; and other people have assisted

him therein: but they utter an unjust thing, and a falsehood.' They also say, 'These are the fables of the ancients, which he hath caused to be written down; and they are dictated unto him morning and evening. Say, He hath revealed it, who knoweth the secrets in heaven and earth: verily he is gracious and merciful. And they say, What kind of apostle is this? He eateth food, and walketh in the streets, as we do: unless an angel be sent down unto him, and become a fellow-preacher with him; or unless a treasure be cast down unto him; or he have a garden, of the fruit whereof he may eat; we will not believe.' The ungodly also say, 'Ye follow no other than a man who is distracted.' . .

"And the apostle shall say, 'O Lord, verily my people esteemed this Koran to be a vain composition. In like manner did we ordain unto every prophet an enemy from among the wicked; but thy Lord is a sufficient director, and defender.' The unbelievers say, 'Unless the Koran is sent down unto us entire at once, we will not believe.' But in this manner have we revealed it, that we might confirm thy heart thereby, and we have dictated it gradually, by distinct parcels. They shall not come unto thee with any strange questions; but we will bring thee the truth in answer, and a most excellent interpretation."

FROM CHAPTER XXVI.

"The devils did not descend with the Koran, as the infidels give out: it is not for their purpose, neither are they able to produce such a book; for they are far removed from hearing the discourse of the angels in heaven. Invoke no other god with the true God, lest thou become one of those who are doomed to punishment. . .

FROM CHAPTER XXIX.

"Dispute not against those who have received the Scriptures, unless in the mildest manner; except against such of them as behave injuriously towards you: and say, 'We believe in the revelation which hath been sent down unto us, and also in that which hath been sent down unto you; our God and your God is one, and unto him are we resigned. Thus have we sent down

the book of the Koran unto thee; and they unto whom we have given the former Scriptures, believe therein; and of these Arabians also there is who believeth therein, and none reject our signs except the obstinate infidels. Thou couldst not read any book before this; neither couldest thou write it with thy right hand; then had the gainsayers justly doubted of the divine original thereof. But the same is evident signs in the breasts of those who have received understanding; for none reject our signs except the unjust. They say, 'Unless a sign be sent down unto him from his Lord, we will not believe." Answer, 'Signs are in the power of God alone, and I am no more than a public preacher.' Is it not sufficient for them that we have sent down unto thee the book of the Koran to be read unto them?' "

FROM CHAPTER XXXII.

"The revelation of this book, there is no doubt thereof, is from the Lord of all creatures. Will they say, 'Mohammed hath forged it?' Nay, it is the truth from thy Lord, that thou mayest preach to a people unto whom no preacher hath come before thee; peradventure they will be directed."

FROM CHAPTER XXXIII.

"Ye have in the apostle of God an excellent example, unto him who hopeth in God and the last day, and remembereth God frequently. . .

"O, wives of the prophet, whosoever of you shall commit a manifest wickedness, the punishment thereof shall be doubled unto her twofold; and this is easy with God; but whosoever of you shall be obedient to God and his apostle, and shall do that which is right, we will give her her reward twice, and we have prepared for her an honourable provision in paradise. O, wives of the prophet, ye are not as other women; if ye fear God, be not too complaisant in speech, lest he should covet in whose heart is a disease of incontinence; but speak the speech which is convenient. And sit still in your houses; and set not out yourselves with the ostentation of former times of ignorance, and observe the appointed times of prayer, and give

a'ms, and obey God and his apostle; for God desireth only to remove from you the abomination of vanity, since ye are the household of the prophet, and to purify you by a perfect purification. And remember that which is read in your houses, of the signs of God, and of the wisdom revealed in the Koran; for God is clear-sighted, and well acquainted with your actions." . .

Respecting his slave's wife, whom he had espoused, God is made to say:

"Keep thy wife to thyself, and fear God; and if thou didst conceal that in thy mind which God had determined to discover, and didst fear men, whereas it was more just that thou shouldst fear God. But when Zeid had determined the matter concerning his wife, and had resolved to divorce her, we joined her in marriage unto thee, lest a crime should be charged on the true believers, in marrying the wives of their adopted sons, when they had determined the matter concerning them, and the command of God is to be performed. No crime is to be charged on the prophet, as to what God hath allowed him, conformable to the ordinance of God, with regard to those who preceded him (for the command of God is a determinate decree), who brought the messages of God, and feared him, and feared more besides God, and God is a sufficient accomptant. Mohammed is not the father of any man among you; but the apostle of God, and the seal of the prophets, and God knoweth all things." . .

"O, prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives, unto whom thou hast given their dower, and also the slaves which thy right hand possesseth, of the booty which God hath granted thee, and the daughters of thy uncle, and the daughters of thy aunts, both on thy father's side and on thy mother's side, who have fled with thee from Mecca, and any other believing women, if she give herself unto the prophet, in case the prophet desireth to take her to wife. This is a peculiar privilege granted unto the rest of the true believers. We know what we have ordained them concerning their wives and the slaves whom their

right hands possess; lest it should be deemed a crime in thee to make use of the privilege granted thee; for God is gracious and merciful. Thou mayest postpone the turn of such of thy wives as thou shalt please, in being called to thy bed, and thou mayest take unto thee her whom thou shalt please, and her whom thou shalt desire of those whom thou shalt have before rejected; and it shall be no crime in thee." . .

"O, true believers, enter not the houses of the prophet, unless it be permitted you to eat meat with him, without waiting his convenient time; but when ye are invited, then enter. And when ye shall have eaten, disperse yourselves, and stay not to enter into familiar discourse, for this incommodeth the prophet. He is ashamed to bid you depart; but God is not ashamed of the truth. And when you ask of the prophet's wives what ye may have occasion for, ask it of them from behind a curtain; this will be more pure for your hearts and their hearts. Neither is it fit for you to give any uneasiness to the apostle of God, or to marry his wives after him for ever; for this would be a grievous thing in the sight of God."

FROM CHAPTER XXXIV.

"When our evident signs are read unto them, they say of thee, O, Mohammed, 'This is no other than a man who seeketh to turn you aside from the gods which your fathers worshipped.' And they say of the Koran, 'This is no other than a lie, blasphemously forged.' And the unbelievers say of the truth when it is come unto them, 'This is no other than manifest sorcery;' yet we have given them no books of Scripture wherein to exercise themselves, nor have we sent unto them any warner before thee. They who were before them in like manner accused their prophets of imposture; but these have not arrived unto the tenth part of the riches and strength which we had bestowed on the former; and they accused my apostles of imposture; and how severe was my vengeance!"

FROM CHAPTER XXXV.

"Thou art no other than a preacher; verily we have sent thee with truth, a bearer of good tidings, and a denouncer of

threats. There hath been no nation but a preacher hath in past times been conversant among them; if they charge thee with imposture, they who were before them likewise charged their apostles with imposture."

"That which we have revealed unto thee of the book of the Koran, is the truth, confirming the Scriptures, which were revealed before it; for God knoweth and regardeth his servants, and we have given the book of the Koran in heritage unto such of our servants as we have chosen; of them there is one who injureth his own soul; and there is another of them who keepeth the middle way; and there is another of them who outstrippeth others in good works, by the permission of God."

FROM CHAPTER XXXVI.

"We have not taught Mohammed the art of poetry, nor is it expedient for him to be a poet. This book is no other than an admonition from God, and a perspicuous Koran; that he may warn him who is living, and the sentence of condemnation will be justly executed on the unbelievers."

FROM CHAPTER XXXVII.

"Thus will we deal with the wicked; because when it is said unto them, 'There is no god besides the true God,' they swell with arrogance, and say, 'Shall we abandon our gods for a distracted poet?' Nay, he cometh with the truth, and beareth witness to the former apostles. Ye shall surely taste the painful torments of hell; and ye shall not be rewarded but according to your works. But as for the sincere servants of God, they shall have a certain provision in paradise, namely, delicious fruits; and they shall be honoured; they shall be placed in gardens of pleasure, leaning on couches, opposite to one another; a cup shall be carried round unto them, filled from a limpid fountain, for the delight of those who drink; it shall not oppress the understanding, neither shall they be inebriated therewith. And near them shall lie the virgins of paradise, refraining their looks from beholding any besides their spouses, having large black eyes, and resembling the eggs of an ostrich, covered with feathers from the dust."

"Inquire of the Meccans whether thy Lord hath daughters, and they sons? Have we created the angels of the female sex? and were they witnesses thereof? Do they not say of their own false invention, God hath begotten issue? and are they not really liars? Hath he chosen daughters preferably to sons? Ye have no reason to judge thus."

FROM CHAPTER XLI.

"If we had revealed the Koran in a foreign language, they had surely said, unless the signs thereof be distinctly explained, we will not receive the same: is the book written in a foreign tongue, and the person unto whom it is directed an Arabian? Answer, it is, unto those who believe, a sure guide, and a remedy for doubt and uncertainty: but unto those who believe not, it is a thickness of hearing in their ears and it is a darkness which covereth them; these are as they who are called unto from a distant place."

FROM CHAPTER XLII.

"He hath ordained you the religion which he commanded Noah, and which we have revealed unto thee, O Mohammed, and which we commanded Abraham, and Moses, and Jesus: saying, observe this religion, and be not divided therein. The worship of one God, to which thou invitest them, is grievous unto the unbelievers: God will elect thereto whom he pleaseth, and will direct unto the same him who shall repent."

FROM CHAPTER XLIII.

"And when the son of Mary was proposed for an example; behold, the people cried out through excess of joy thereat; and they said, are our gods better, or he? They have proposed this instance unto thee no otherwise than for an occasion of dispute; yea, they are contentious men. Jesus is no other than a servant, whom we favoured with the gift of prophecy; and we appointed him for an example unto the children of Israel (if we pleased, verily we could from yourselves produce angels, to succeed you in the earth): and he shall be a sign of the approach of the last hour; wherefore doubt not thereof. And follow me; this is the right way. And let not Satan cause you

to turn aside; for he is your open enemy. And when Jesus came with evident miracles, he said, now I am come unto you with wisdom, and to explain unto you part of those things concerning which ye disagree; wherefore fear God, and obey me."

FROM CHAPTER XLIV.

Afterwards we appointed thee, O Mohammed, to promulgate a law concerning the business of religion; wherefore follow the same, and follow not the desires of those who are ignorant. Verily they shall not avail thee against God at all: the unjust are the patrons of one another; but God is the patron of the pious. This Koran delivereth evident precepts unto mankind; and is a direction, and a mercy, unto people who judge aright."

FROM CHAPTER XLVI.

"Bring me a book of Scripture revealed before this, or some footstep of ancient knowledge, to countenance your idolatrous practices; if ye are men of veracity."

"When our evident signs are rehearsed unto them, the unbelievers say of the truth, when it cometh unto them, 'this is a manifest piece of sorcery.' Will they say, Mohammed hath forged it? Answer, if I have forged it, verily ye shall not obtain for me any favour from God: he well knoweth the injurious language which ye utter concerning it: he is a sufficient witness between me and you; and he is gracious and merciful. Say, I am not singular among the apostles; neither do I know what will be done with me or with you hereafter; I follow no other than what is revealed unto me: neither am I any more than a public warner."

FROM CHAPTER XLVII.

"The description of paradise, which is promised unto the pious: Therein are rivers of incorruptible water, the rivers of milk, the taste whereof changeth not, and rivers of wine, pleasant unto those who drink; and rivers of clarified honey; and therein shall they have plenty of all kinds of fruits; and pardon from their Lord. Shall the men for whom these things are prepared, be as they who must dwell for ever in hell fire; and

will have the boiling water given them to drink, which shall burst their bowels?"

FROM CHAPTER XLVIII.

"Now hath God in truth verified unto his apostle the vision, wherein he said, 'Ye shall surely enter the holy temple of Mecca, if God please, in full security; having your heads shaved and your hair cut; ye shall not fear, for God knoweth that which ye know not; and he hath appointed you, besides this, a speedy victory.' It is he who hath sent his apostle with the direction, and the religion of truth, that he may exalt the same above every religion, and God is a sufficient witness thereof. Mohammed is the apostle of God; and those who are with him are fierce against the unbelievers, but compassionate towards one another. Thou mayest see them bowing down."

FROM CHAPTER LII.

"Wherefore do thou, O, prophet, admonish thy people. Thou art not, by the grace of thy Lord, a soothsayer or a madman. Do they say, 'He is a poet; we wait concerning him, some adverse turn of fortune?' Say, 'Wait ye my ruin? verily I wait with you the time of your destruction.' Do their mature understandings bid them say this, or are they people who perversely transgress? Do they say, 'He hath forged the Koran?' Verily they believe not. Let them produce a discourse like unto it, if they speak truth."

FROM CHAPTER LIII.

"By the star, when it setteth, your companion Mohammed erreth not, nor is he led astray, neither doth he speak of his own will. It is no other than a revelation which hath been revealed unto him. One mighty in power, endued with understanding, taught it him, and he appeared in the highest part of the horizon. Afterwards he approached the prophet, and drew near unto him, until he was at the distance of two bows' length from him, or yet nearer, and he revealed unto his servant that which he revealed. The heart of Mohammed did not falsely represent that which he saw. Will ye therefore dispute with

him concerning that which he saw? He also saw him another time, by the lote tree beyond which there is no passing; near it the garden of eternal abode. When the lote tree covered that which it covered, his eye-sight turned not aside, neither did it wander, and he really beheld some of the greatest signs of his Lord."

FROM CHAPTER LVI.

"When the inevitable day of judgment shall suddenly come, no soul shall charge the prediction of its coming with falsehood; it will abase some and exalt others. When the earth shall be shaken with a violent shock, and the mountains shall be dashed in pieces, and shall become as dust scattered abroad, and ye shall be separated into three distinct classes; the companies of the right hand (how happy shall the companions of the right hand be!); and the companions of the left hand (how miserable shall the companions of the left hand be!); and those who have preceded others in the faith, shall precede them to paradise. These are they who shall approach near unto God; they shall dwell in gardens of delight (there shall be many of the former religions, and few of the last). Reposing on couches adorned with gold and precious stones; sitting opposite to one another thereon. Youths, which shall continue in their bloom for ever, shall go round about to attend them with goblets and beakers, and a cup of flowing wine; their heads shall not ache by drinking the same, neither shall their reason be disturbed; and with fruits of the sorts which they shall choose, and the flesh of birds of the kind which they shall desire. And there shall accompany them fair damsels having large black eyes, resembling pearls hidden in their shells; as a reward for that which they shall have wrought. They shall not hear therein any vain discourse, or any charge of sin; but only the salutation, Peace! Peace! And the companions of the right hand (how happy shall the companions of the right hand be!) shall have their abode among lote trees free from thorns, and trees of mauz, loaded regularly with their produce from top to bottom; under an extended shade, near a flowing water, amidst fruits in abundance,

which shall not fail; nor shall be forbidden to be gathered, and they shall repose themselves on lofty beds. Verily we have created the damsels of paradise by a peculiar creation, and we have made them virgins, beloved by their husbands of equal age with them; for the delight of the companions of the right hand." . .

"I swear by the setting of the stars (and it is surely a great oath, if ye knew it), that this is the excellent Koran, the original whereof is written in the preserved book; none shall touch the same except those who are clean. It is a revelation from the Lord of all creatures. Will ye, therefore, despise this new revelation."

FROM CHAPTER LIX.

"And as to the spoils of these people which God hath granted wholly to his apostle, ye did not push forth any horses or camels against the same, but God giveth unto his apostles dominion over whom he pleaseth, for God is almighty. The spoils of the inhabitants of the towns which God hath granted to his apostle, are due unto God and to the apostle, and him who is of kin to the apostle, and the orphans, and the poor, and the traveller; that they may not be for ever divided in a circle among such of you as are rich. What the apostle shall give you, that accept; and what he shall forbid you, that abstain from, and fear God; for God is severe in chastising."

FROM CHAPTER LX.

"O true believers, take not my enemy and your enemy for your friends, showing kindness towards them; since they believe not in the truth which hath come unto you, having expelled the apostle and yourselves from your native city, because ye believe in God, your Lord. If ye go forth to fight in defence of my religion, and out of a desire to please me, and privately show friendship unto them; verily I well know that which ye conceal, and that which ye discover: and whoever of you doth this, hath already erred from the straight path."

FROM CHAPTER LXII.

"Verily God loveth those who fight for his religion in battle array, as though they were a well compacted building. Re-

member when Moses said unto his people, O my people, why do ye injure me; since ye know that I am the apostle of God sent unto you? And when they had deviated from the truth, God made their hearts to deviate from the right way; for God directeth not wicked people. And when Jesus, the son of Mary, said, O children of Israel, verily I am the apostle of God sent unto you, confirming the law which was delivered before me, and bringing good tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, and whose name shall be Ahmed, and when he produced unto them evident miracles, they said, this is manifest sorcery. But who is more unjust than he who forgeth a lie against God, when he is invited unto Islam.

"O true believers, be ye the assistants of God: as Jesus, the son of Mary, said to the apostles, who will be my assistants with respect to God? The apostles answered, we will be the assistants of God."

FROM CHAPTER LXVI.

"O prophet, why holdest thou that to be prohibited which God hath allowed thee, seeking to please thy wives: since God is inclined to forgive, and be merciful? God hath allowed you the dissolution of your oaths; and God is your master, and he is knowing and wise. When the prophet intrusted as a secret unto one of his wives a certain accident, and when she disclosed the same, and God made it known unto him, he acquainted her with part of what she had done and forebore to upbraid her with the other part thereof, and when he had acquainted her therewith, she said, who hath discovered this unto thee? He answered, the knowing, the sagacious God hath discovered it unto me. If ye both be turned unto God (for your hearts have swerved) it is well: but if ye join against him, verily God is his patron; and Gabriel, and the good man among the faithful, and the angels also are his assistants. If he divorce you, his Lord can easily give him in exchange other wives better than you, women resigned unto God, true believers, devout, penitent, obedient, given to fasting, both such as have been known by other men, and virgins." . .

"God also propoundeth as a similitude unto those who be-

lieve, the wife of Pharaoh; when she said, Lord, build me an house in paradise; and deliver me from Pharaoh and his doings, and deliver me from the unjust people; and Mary, the daughter of Imram who preserved her chastity, and into whose womb we breathed of our spirit, and who believed in the words of her Lord and his Scriptures, and who was a devout and obedient person."

FROM CHAPTER LXVIII.

"By the pen, and what they write, thou, O Mohammed, through the grace of thy Lord, are not distracted. Verily there is prepared for thee an everlasting reward: for thou art of a noble disposition. Thou shalt see, and the infidels shall see, which of you are bereaved of your senses. Verily thy Lord well knoweth him who wandereth from his path; and he well knoweth those who are rightly directed: wherefore obey not those who charge thee with imposture."

FROM CHAPTER LXIX.

"I swear, by that which ye see, and that which ye see not, that this is the discourse of an honourable apostle, and not the discourse of a poet: how little do ye believe! Neither is it the discourse of a soothsayer: how little are ye admonished! It is a revelation from the Lord of all creatures. If Mohammed had forged any part of these discoveries concerning us, verily we had taken him by the right hand, and had cut in sunder the vein of his heart; neither would we have withheld any of you from chastising him. And verily this book is an admonition unto the pious; and we well know that there are some of you who charge the same with imposture: but it shall surely be an occasion of grievous sighing unto infidels; for it is truth of a certainty. Wherefore praise the name of thy Lord, the great God."

FROM CHAPTER LXXII.

"Say, It hath been revealed unto me, that a company of genii attentively heard me reading the Koran, and said, Verily we have heard an admirable discourse: which directeth unto the right institution: wherefore we believe therein, and we will by

no means associate any other with our Lord. He (may the majesty of our Lord be exalted!) hath taken no wife, nor hath he begotten any issue. Yet the foolish among us hath spoken that which is extremely false of God: but we verily thought that neither man nor genius would by any means have uttered a lie concerning God. And there are certain men who fly for refuge unto certain of the genii; but they increase their folly and transgression: and they also thought, as ye thought, that God would not raise any one to life. And we formerly attempted to pry into what was transacting in heaven; but we found the same filled with a strong guard of angels, and with flaming darts: and we sat on some of the seats thereof to hear the discourse of its inhabitants; but whoever listeneth now findeth a flame laid in ambush for him, to guard the celestial confines."

FROM CHAPTER LXXV.

"Move not thy tongue, O Mohammed, in repeating the revelations brought thee by Gabriel, before he shall have finished the same, that thou mayest quickly commit them to memory: for the collecting the Koran in thy mind, and the teaching thee the true reading thereof are incumbent on us. But when we shall have read the same unto thee by the tongue of the angel, do thou follow the reading thereof: and afterwards it shall be our part to explain it unto thee. By no means shalt thou be thus hasty for the future."

FROM CHAPTER LXXX.

"By no means shouldst thou act thus. Verily the Koran is an admonition (and he who is willing retaineth the same), written in volumes honourable, exalted, and pure; by the hands of scribes honoured and just. May man be cursed! What hath seduced him to infidelity? Verily I swear, by the stars which are retrograde, which move swiftly, and which hide themselves; and by night, when it cometh on; by the morning, when it appeareth; that these are the words of an honourable messenger, endued with strength, of established dignity in the sight of the possessor of the throne obeyed by the angels under his authority, and faithful: and your companion Mohammed is

not distracted. He had already seen him in the clear horizon: and he suspected not the secrets revealed unto him. Neither are these the words of an accursed devil."

FROM CHAPTER LXXXIII.

"Verily the righteous shall dwell among delights: seated on couches, they shall behold objects of pleasure; thou shalt see in their faces the brightness of joy. They shall be given to drink of pure wine sealed; the seal whereof shall be musk: and to this let those aspire, who aspire to happiness: and the water mixed therewith shall be of Tasnim, a fountain whereof those shall drink who approach near unto the Divine Presence."

FROM CHAPTER LXXXV.

"Yet the unbelievers cease not to accuse the divine revelations of falsehood: but God encompasseth them behind, that they cannot escape. Verily that which they reject is a glorious Koran; the original whereof is written in a table kept in heaven."

FROM CHAPTER LXXXVIII.

"Hath the news of the overwhelming day of judgment reached thee? The countenances of some, on that day, shall be cast down; labouring and toiling, they shall be cast into scorching fire to be broiled: they shall be given to drink of a boiling fountain; they shall have no food, but of dry thorns and thistles, which shall not fatten, neither shall they satisfy hunger. But the countenances of others, on that day, shall be joyful, well pleased with their past endeavour; they shall be placed in a lofty garden, wherein thou shalt hear no vain discourse; therein shall be a running fountain: therein shall be raised beds, and goblets placed before them, and cushions laid in order, and carpets ready spread. Do they not consider the camels, how they are created; and the heaven how it is raised; and the mountains, how they are fixed; and the earth, how it is extended? Wherefore warn thy people; for thou art a warner only; thou art not empowered to act with authority over them."

So much for the Koran; there is no necessity to expatiate on its impious doctrines. It is enough to recall the use that its author made of his inspirations.

Whenever the apostle wants to regulate a family concern, or an amorous transaction of his own, he immediately has recourse to the angel Gabriel. When his rebellious wives vex him for new clothes, he makes the Almighty address him thus:—

"'O, prophet, say unto thy wives, "If ye seek the present life and the pomp thereof, come, and I will make a handsome provision for you, and I will dismiss you with an honourable dismission; but if you seek God, and his apostle, and the life to come, verily God hath prepared for such of you as work righteousness, a great reward."'

Again, when he wishes to justify his marriages with his cousin's wife, thus speaks his Lord:—

"'O, prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives, unto whom thou hast given their dower; and also the slaves which thy right hand possesseth, of the booty which God hath granted thee; and the daughters of thy uncles, and the daughters of thy aunts, both on thy father's side, and on thy mother's side, who have fled with thee from Mecca, and any other believing woman, if she give herself to the prophet, in case the prophet desireth to make her his wife. This is a peculiar privilege granted unto thee, above the rest of all true believers. We know what we have ordained them, concerning their wives, and the slaves they possess, lest it should be deemed a crime in thee to make use of the privileges granted thee, for God is just and merciful. Thou mayest postpone the turn of such of thy wives as thou shalt please in being called to thy bed; and thou mayest take unto thee her whom thou shalt please, and her whom thou shalt desire, of those whom thou shalt have before rejected, and it shall be no crime in thee; this will be more easy, that they may be entirely content.'"

And again, when he is tormented with troublesome visitors, the Deity is made to address the intruders:—

"'O, true believers, enter not the house of the prophet, unless it be permitted you to eat meat with him, without waiting his convenient time. And when you ask of the prophet's wives what ye may have occasion for, ask it of them behind a curtain, this will be more pure for your hearts and their hearts. Neither is it fit for you to give any uneasiness to the apostle of God, or to marry his wives after him, for ever; for this would be a grievous thing in the sight of God.'"

The Sonna, or duly authorised authentic traditions of the sayings, spoken judgments, and oral discourses and commands of the prophet duly examined and pronounced by competent functionaries of state, by learned Ulemas and doctors of the law of Islam, worthy of being received with the same faith and reverence as the doctrines revealed in the Koran, are only called in question by heterodox Moslems, of the Schüte sect of Ali.

"The word of the prophet," says Ockley, "is the Sonna, that is, the collection of his orations and oral commands, which, no less than in the written Koran, by vivid fancy, energy of will, power of language, and knowledge of mankind, manifest the genius of the great poet and legislator."

Among the oral revelations of Mohammed, those in which he gave to his followers, the particulars of his night journey to heaven, which he has twice referred to in the Koran, are among the authorised traditions.

TRADITIONS OF THE SONNA OF HEAVEN AND HELL.

When a corpse is laid in the grave the Koran says he is visited by two examiners, two black livid angels of a terrible appearance, named Monker and Nakir. These make the dead person sit upright, and examine him concerning his faith in the Koran. If he answer rightly, the body is refreshed with the air of paradise, but if not, they beat him on the temples with iron maces, till he roars aloud for anguish. Then they press earth on the corpse, which is gnawed till the resurrection by

99 dragons, with seven heads each, for which reasons Mohammedans have their graves made hollow, that they may be able to sit up during the examination. There is an interval between death and the resurrection called al Benzakh. Mohammed says every part of the body is condemned except the os coccygis or last vertebral-bone, which serves for the basis of the future edifice, and the whole would be renewed from it.

At the last judgment Mohammed undertakes the office of intercessor for mankind, after it shall have been declined by Jesus, Noah, Abraham, &c., who only sue for the salvation of their own souls. After the judgment, both good and bad must pass over the bridge (al Sirat) laid over the midst of hell—finer than a hair, and sharper than a sword. The good shall pass over with safety, but the bad shall fall headlong into hell. Hell is divided into seven stories, for the different classes of the damned—the first for the temporary punishment of the bad Mohammedans, the second for the Jews, the third for the Christians, the fourth for the Sabians, the fifth for the Magians, the sixth for the idolaters, and the seventh for the hypocrites, which is the lowest of all. The torments of hell will be intense heat and cold, the pain will be proportionate, and the lightest of all pains will be to be shod with shoes of fire, the fervour of which will cause his skull to boil like a cauldron. Infidels only will suffer eternity of damnation, but Moslems will be delivered hence after they have expiated their crimes; the period will be from 900 to 7,000 years. The partition-wall betwixt hell and paradise is so thin that the blessed and the damned will be able to converse. The good, having passed the bridge, before they enter paradise will be refreshed by drinking at their prophet's pond, which is supplied with two pipes from al Cawthar, one of the rivers in Paradise, and which is surrounded by as many cups as there are stars in the sky, and whoever drinks will thirst no more. Paradise is situated in the seventh heaven. Its earth is of musk, its stones are pearls, its walls of silver, and the trunks of its trees of gold. The most extraordinary is that tree called Juba, or the tree of happiness,

in the palace of Mohammed, with a branch spreading to the house of true Moslem, laden with pomegranates, grapes, and dates of size and taste unknown to mortals. Whatever fruit a man wishes it presents to him, or fish or flesh ready dressed according to his wish; the boughs bend down towards him who stretches to them, and supplies not only food but silken garments, and beasts to ride on ready saddled, bursting from its fruits. The tree is so large that a fleet horse could not gallop round it in a hundred years. There are a profusion of rivers of milk, and wine, and honey—fountains and streams of living water, whose pebbles are rubies, whose beds are camphire, whose sides are saffron. But all these glories will be eclipsed by the resplendent eyes of the enchanting maidens of paradise, whose company is the principal felicity of the faithful, and are secluded from public view (for they are of surprising modesty) in pavilions of hollow pearls of amazing size. Mahommed will be the first admitted into Paradise, and the poor will enter five hundred years before the rich. Nor is this the only privilege the poor shall enjoy, for in his night journey to heaven, he declares when he took a view of Paradise the majority of its inhabitants were poor; and looking into hell, the majority were women.

For the first entertainment of the blessed the whole earth will be as one loaf of bread, which God will serve with his own hand; and for meat they will have the ox Balam and the fish Nun, the lobes of whose livers will suffice 70,000 men. The meanest person will have 82,000 servants, 72 wives of the maidens of paradise, besides the wives he had in this world, and a tent of jacinths and emeralds of great extent. There will be wine in abundance (though forbidden in this world) but will not inebriate.

To such pleasures an impudent Jew objected to Mohammed, that so much eating and drinking would be attended with inconvenience; but the prophet answered, the blessed had no need to apprehend any inconvenience or incommodity. The

blessed we are told will be richly clad in silks, and chiefly of green, and adorned with bracelets of gold and silver.

They will always be thirty years of age (and the damned likewise). The angel, Israfil, the most melodious of God's creatures, and of the daughters of paradise, will delight the ear with the most ravishing songs, and the clashing of the golden bodied trees, set in motion by the wind, proceeding from the throne of God, will produce delicious music, for the fruits are pearls and emeralds, striking together like bells. Even brute beasts are turned loose upon the excellent pasture. In short, eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, these pleasures (an expression evidently taken from the Scriptures). Predestination is the leading doctrine of the Koran. It says that the practice of religion is founded on cleanliness, which is one half of the faith, without which it will not be heard by God. Circumcision is not once mentioned in the Koran. Prayer is prescribed five times a day: 1st. In the morning, before sunrise; 2nd. When noon is past; 3rd. Before sunset; 4th. Before day be shut in; 5th. After the day is shut in. The Mahommedans never address themselves to God in sumptuous apparel, and they admit not their women to pray with them in public, that sex being obliged to pray at home; for the Moslems are of opinion that their presence inspires a different kind of devotion from what is requisite in a place dedicated to the worship of God. Almsgiving is commanded in the Koran, about one part in forty being the proportion. The Khalif Omar says prayer carries us half way to God; fasting bring us to the door of his palace; and alms gain us admittance. The Mahommedans are obliged to fast the entire month of the Rammedan, during which they must abstain from eating, drinking, and women, from daybreak till night. A pilgrimage to Mecca is strictly enjoined. It was a place of worship many centuries before Mohammed. The pilgrims having arrived in Mecca, proceed in procession round the Caaba seven times in a quick pace first, then slow; after this they run between mounts Lafa and Merwa. Then

proceeding in a tumultuous manner to Mount Arafat, and then at an oratory near Mina, they spend the night in prayer, and reading the Koran. Then they slay the victims of sheep or goats, then shave their heads and cut their nails, after which the pilgrimage is completed.

Polygamy is allowed by the Koran; but no man can have more than four partners in his affections, whether wives or concubines. Divorce is allowed. Fornication in either sex is punished with one hundred stripes: adultery more severely. Mohammed gave himself the privilege of taking as many wives, and as many concubines, as he pleased; and that he might take them to his bed, without having them in turn, and no one was allowed even to cohabit with his wives or concubines. As to inheritance, the general rule is, a male shall have twice as much as a female. The children by concubines are as legitimate as those by legal wives. The disciples of Mohammed of the privileged sex are told in the Koran. "When your wives are perverse cease to cohabit with them, and *chastise them;* for men have the pre-eminence above women." See Sale's Koran, Prideaux's Life of Mohammed, Rowland's Doctrines of Mohammedans.

The religion which enjoins belief in doctrines so inimical to civilization and to Christianity, to humanity at large, as those of the Koran, embodied in such ridiculous legends as those of the Sonna, is unfortunately widely disseminated. In twelve centuries Mohammedanism has overrun half the old world, and has acquired in it, by the sword, numbers of members, only less by one-fifth, than those Christianity has gained by the Gospel, which are estimated, in both hemispheres, at the expiration of eighteen centuries and a-half from its origin, at two hundred millions.*

* In 1823 an eminent German statician estimated the population of the world at 820 millions—thus distributed:

Christians	200	millions.
Mahommedans	165	,,
Pagans	450	,,
Jews	5	,,
	820	,,

More recent estimates have raised the numbers to upwards of 1,000 millions.

CHAPTER IV.

The Caliphate, and Saracen Race.

LIEUTENANT BURTON, in his "Pilgrimage to Medina and Mecca" (Lon. 1855, vol. ii., p. 165), defining the limits of the Hedjaz, says that "some authors (as Abulfeda), fix the northern frontier at Aylah and the Desert, making Yemen its southern limit; others include in it only the tract of land lying between Mecca and Medina." But he includes in it all the territory between Yamba and Jeddah, the northern and southern extremities, and from Medina to the mountain of Taif, its eastern boundary. Thus El Hedjaz would be an irregular parallelogram, about 120 miles in length, with a maximum breadth of 150 miles.

The religion of the Arabians, we are informed by Sale, prior to Mahommed's revolution, was the Sabian, but great numbers of Christians, Jews, and Persian Magians, were settled amongst them. The Sabians were idolators. They professed to believe one supreme God, but they worshipped chiefly the sun, moon, and stars, and the angels or intelligences which they held, resided in the heavenly bodies, and governed the universal world under the supreme authority of the one Great God. They had a confused idea of man's destination in the other world. They believed that the good would be translated to heaven, but the bad would be punished for a term of 9,000 ages, at the end of which time they would be saved. They prayed three times a day—immediately before sunrise, at noon, and at sunset—their

prayers consisting of acts of adoration, and numerous prostrations. They offered burned sacrifices to their divinities, prayed with their faces to the Kebla stone of Mecca, or the particular planet they worshipped; they made pilgrimages to the temple at Mecca, and to a holy place near the city of Harran in Mesopotamia. And they held the great pyramids of Egypt in veneration, believing them to be the sepulchres of Seth, and his sons, Enoch and Saki, whom they considered as the founders of their religion; at the Pyramids they sacrificed a cock and a black calf, and burned incense.

The supreme God of the Arabs was called Allah Taâla, the most high; the other deities of all kinds subordinate to him they called Ilhahat—the Goddesses.

The sacrifice of female children certainly prevailed among some tribes, and also the sacrifice of children at certain festivals in honor of their deities.

The Arabs worshipped not only the stars, but a great many idols of rude stones of large dimensions, some of images of human beings, male and female, and of subordinate divinities. They had oracles in sacred places, and every head of a family had his household idol or idols, whom he never left his home, nor entered, without saluting. Some of the Arab tribes, according to Sale, "believed neither a creation past nor a resurrection to come, attributing the origin of things to nature, and their dissolution to age." Be it observed, once for all, that Sale, the learned, able, and accurate translator of the Koran, is an apologist of Mohammedanism, a eulogist of the great Arab impostor, an upholder of the excellence of his doctrines, an enthusiastic admirer of his efforts and his labours as a religious reformer; consequently he endeavours to place his opponents—the Arabs who held the doctrines of the Sabæans, in the worst light before his reader, and to represent their religion, and that also of the Christians and Jews who were scattered among them, as far inferior in all respects to that of the great reformer, Mohammed.

The Arabians of Jezirat al Arab, the Peninsular of the Ara-

bians, attribute their origin, as a nation, in a small territory in the province of Jehama, named Araba, to Yarab, the son of Kahlan, "the father of the ancient Arabs, in whose country, some ages subsequently to that in which Yarab flourished, dwelt Ishmael, the son of Abraham, by Hagar."

The early Christian writers speak of the Arabs almost universally as Saracens, a term of uncertain derivation, which Sale, and some later writers give as the most certain derivation from the word Shark, the East, where the descendants of Joctan (the Kahlan of the Arabs), are placed by Moses—Gen. x. 30.

M. De Ryer, the French translator of the Koran, however, derives the term Saracen from the name of a town named Sahrab.

The Arabs of the Hedjaz were ruled for a long time by Sovereign princes; Jaram, the son of Kahlan, ruled over the country till the time of Ishmael, at whose death dissensions arose, and the government was divided among the heads of tribes; the most influential was that of Roreim; of that tribe Mohammed was descended.

Sale says, "The Arabs have preserved their liberty, of which few nations can produce such ancient monuments, with very little interruption, from the very deluge, for although very great armies have been sent against them, all attempts to subdue them have been unsuccessful."*

The people whom we call Saracens, are the ancient Arab inhabitants of the territory of the Hedjaz, of whom mention is made in history from the time of Mohammed to the period of the extinction of the Caliphate. The most remarkable distinction between the Saracenic Arabic race, and the Tartar Turkish tribes, is the absence in the latter of creative power, of invention, of imagination, of mental tendencies towards metaphysical speculations, controversial inquiries, of aptitude and taste for art, and capabilities for progress, and, above all other peculiarities of the

* Sale's Koran. Preliminary Observations, p. 10.

Tartar Turish race, the remarkable reluctance, and the apparent inability, to repair losses or decadence of any kind with their own materials, to develope resources from within, to discover and substitute new implements of industry, new elements of power, new agencies, new polity for lost advantage or decayed forces, worn out appliances, or old crazy, lumbering institutions. When they took possession of rich and fertile nations, they had recourse to the old inhabitants reduced to servitude, for agricultural labourers. When they required to build fortresses, bridges, to raise walls, and fortify towns, they had recourse to foreign aid. The giaours of the provinces of Syria, Roumania, and the Islands tilled the soil for them. The Jews and the Armenians managed their money concerns and financial affairs, and the Franks transacted their mercantile business. The Greeks manned their fleets, and the kidnapped children of the Greeks, in the best days of their empire, did their fighting in the corps of Janissaries.

In all mental respects to which I have alluded, the Turks differed essentially from the Saracens, as widely as torpidity and dullness differ from life and energy, light from darkness, aptitude for art, science, and knowledge, and aspirations that exalt and ennoble intellect, from instincts that enslave and debase it, and render ignorance insolent and invincible.

Southgate considers the absence of religious controversy among the Turks, contrasted with its frequency of old among the Saracens, as a proof of the decay of the spirit of Islam. I should rather refer the present apathy to the national temperament of the Turks, and set it down, with other instances I shall mention presently, as results of their barbarism; but it will be sufficient for the moment, to view it simply as a characteristic in point of fact of Saracenic Mohammedanism. It would give an apposite illustration of what is meant by an "interior" people, if one might borrow a devotional word to express a philosophical idea. A barbarous nation has no "interior," but the Saracens show us what a national "interior" is. "In former ages," says an author to whom I have elsewhere referred,

"the bosom of Islamism was riven with numerous feuds and schisms, some of which have originated from religious controversy, and others from political ambition. During the first centuries of its existence, and while Mussulman learning flourished under the patronage of the caliphs, religious questions were discussed by the learned with all the proverbial virulence of theological hatred.*

"We see among them no representative of Confucius, and authors of other Chinese sects of a philosphical origin; no magi; no Pisistratus and Harmodius; no Socrates and Alcibiades; no patricians and plebeians; no Cæsar; no invasion or adoption of foreign mysteries; no mythical impersonation of an Ali; no Suffeeism; no Guelphs and Gibellines; nothing really on the type of Catholic religious orders; no Luther; nothing, in short, which for good or evil, marks the presence of a life internal to the political community itself. Some authors, indeed, maintain they have a literature, but I cannot ascertain what the assertion is worth. Rather the tenor of their annals runs thus:—'Two Pachas make war against each other, and a hat-sherif comes from Constantinople for the head of one or the other; or a Pacha exceeds in pillaging his province, or acts rebelliously, and is preferred to a higher government, and suddenly strangled on his way to it; or he successfully maintains himself, and gains an hereditary settlement, still subject, however, to the feudal tenure, which is the principle of the political structure; he continues to send his contingent of troops, when the Sultan goes to war, and remits the ordinary taxes through his agent at Court.' Such is the staple of Turkish history, whether amid the hordes of Turkistan, or the feudatory Turcomans of Anatolia, or the imperial Osmanlis."†

"The divine right of the line of Othman is another of their special political bonds, and this, too, is shown by the following extract from a well-known historian, if it needs showing, to be simply external to themselves; or that they have exer-

* Lectures on the History of the Turks, Lon. 1854.

† Lectures on Turkish History, Lon. 1854.

cised their minds upon it at all, except so far as they have been obliged in a certain degree to do so, in the administration of the law. It is true, also, that they have been obliged to choose to be Sunnites and not Shiahs; but, considering the latter sect arose in Persia, since the Turks have been at Constantinople, it was really no choice at all. Besides, the Shiahs maintain the hereditary transmission of the Caliphate, which would exclude the line of Othman from the succession; good reason, then, the Turks should be Sunnites, and the dates so nearly coincide, that one could even fancy that the Shiahs actually arose in consequence of the Sultan Selim's carrying off the last of the Abasides from Egypt, and gaining the transference of the Caliphate from his captive."*

The Turkish race presents to the observation of Europeans, lineaments, the character of which it is very difficult for a long time to comprehend. There is a grave, sober, settled, calm expression in the traits of a Moslem, a serious, solemn, stolid air in his aspect, which contrasts disagreeably with the old Tartar lineaments of the Turcoman stock, softened, indeed, and fined down, but which connect unmistakably the characteristics of the semi-civilized Osmandi of the Turkish Empire, with those of the wild hordes of marauding nomades of Turkistan. The Turcomans, who ceased to be nomades, roaming over vast spaces, from one place of pasturage to another, who settled in towns and cities, and lived in houses, who went through many vicissitudes of fortune, but still contrived to maintain a permanent position as a dominant race, by taking advantage especially of the favour accorded to them at different periods by different other tribes and people, and perfidiously raising themselves eventually on the ruin of their benefactors' power and prosperity, became the Turks, the Ottoman Empire, a proud insolent, sensual, stupified people, of stolid, unimpassioned, expressionless features, devoid, indeed, of ferocity, but not of pride, cold imperturbable haughtiness, besotted fanatical obsti-

* Lectures on the History of the Turks.

nacy, and a dull, half dormant look of perfidy, never lighted up by a glow of enthusiasm, of generous ardour, or of friendship.

The rude Turcoman's original material of character has permeated many strata of other nationalities, the Saracenic particularly, and has had some foreign qualities mixed up with the Tartar staple commodities of their race, but the latter remain substantially the same, and any modifications they have received are of superficial nature.

In prosperous and commercial countries, corruption of morals always prevails; but in semi-barbarous countries it prevails still more, and most of all in them when the decline and fall of the empire are near at hand, and the impending ruin is gradually descending on a State, or a city that has given itself up to riot and debauchery. An eminent modern author in a work on Turkey, says, "A country such as Turkey, of corrupted morals, and of declining power, is like some old arch, the nation cannot be considered any more a State which stands by the force of cohesion; no one knows how even its supports have crumbled away. It dies a natural death, even though Alaric, Genghis Khan, or Genseric, are near at hand to take possession of the corpse. And centuries before the end comes, patriots may see it coming, though they cannot tell its hour. And when the hour comes surprise is created, not that at length it is come, but that it has been so long delayed."

One of the characteristic qualities of the Turks is stagnation of intellect. They originate nothing, they improve nothing. The Koran comes ready made into their hands, and the commentaries on it from the Saracens, and they accept both. They entertain no doubts, and they venture on no speculations of a controversial kind.

It was the reverse of all this with the Saracens. Their history shews that contentions frequently had an intellectual origin. Gibbon notices the fact that the several factions, denominated White, Green, and Black, severally having supreme power in Cordova, Cairo, and Bagdad, excommunicated each

other, each claiming legitimate succession from Mohammed. And he adds :—

"Then came the fanatical innovation of the Carmathians, who pretended a divine mission to complete the religion of Mohammed, as Mohammed had completed Christianity. They relaxed the duties of ablution, fasting and pilgrimage; admitted the use of wine, and protested against the worldly pomp of the Caliphs. They spread their tents along the coast of the Persian Gulf, and in no long time were able to bring an army of 10,000 men into the field. Ultimately they took up their residence on the borders of Assyria, Syria, and Egypt. As time went on and the power of the Caliphs was still further reduced, religious contention broke out in Bagdad itself, between the rigid and the lax parties, and the followers of Abassides and of Ali."

The origin of the architecture of the Saracens (as it existed in its best days, and at the height of its perfection in Grenada and Seville) has been the subject of much controversy, and of some observation of two recent travellers, remarkable for their intelligence and Oriental acquirements,—Lieutenant Burton, author of "A Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina" (Lon. 8vo., 1855, in two vols.); and William Kennett Loftus, author of "Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susiana" (Lon. 8vo., 1857).

Lieutenant Burton says, "When the Byzantine Christians, after overthrowing the temples of Paganism, meditated re-building and re-modelling them, poverty of invention, and artistic impotence reduced them to group the spoils in a heterogenous mass." . . "Their syncretion, the result of chance and precipitancy of extravagance, and incuriousness fell under eyes too ignorant to be hurt by the irregularity of the Hybrid. It was perpetuated in the so-called Saracenic style, a plagiarism from the Byzantine.

"There is nothing, I believe, new in the Arab mosque; it is an unconscious revival of the forms used, from the earliest ages, to denote by symbolism the worship of the generative and the creative Gods.

"The first mosque in El Islam was erected by Mohammed Kuba, at El Medinah; shortly afterwards, when he entered Mecca as a conqueror, he destroyed the idols of the Arab pantheon, and purified that venerable building of its abominations. He had probably observed in Syria the two forms appropriated by the Christians to their places of worship, the cross and the Basilica: he, therefore preferred a square to a parallelogram, some authors say with others, without a cloister, for the prayers of the 'saving faith.' At length, in the reign of El Walid (about A.H. 90), the cupola, the niche, and the minaret made their appearance, and what is called the Saracenic style became the order of the Moslem world."

"The Hindoos, I believe to have been the first who symbolised, by an equilateral triangle their peculiar cult, the Yoni-Lingam in their temple architecture, it became either a cone or a perfect pyramid. Egypt denoted it by the obelisk, peculiar to that country; and the form appeared in different parts of the world: thus, in England it was a mere upright stone, and in Ireland a round tower. . .

"The Meccan Mosque became a model to the world of El Islam, and the nations that embraced the new faith copied the consecrated building as religiously as Christendom produced imitations of the Holy Sepulchre. The Mosque of Omar, at Jerusalem, of Amr, at Babylon, on the Nile; and Taylun, at Cairo, were erected, with some trifling improvements, such as the arched cloisters, and inscribed cornices, upon the plan of the Kaabah. From Egypt and Palestine the ichnography spread far and wide. It was modified, as might be expected, by national taste; what in Arabia was simple and elegant, became highly ornate in Spain, florid in Turkey, and effeminate in India. Still divergence of detail had not, even after the lapse of twelve centuries, materially altered the fundamental form."*

The speculations of Lieutenant Burton are very far from

* Burton's Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina, vol. i. p. 138.

being, in my opinion, conclusive or satisfactory. The origin which Lieutenant Burton gives Saracenic architecture, of all its pillars, minarets, and elevated domes, being derived originally from types, or representations of the generative or creative deified principles, existing in the Byzantine Empire, from the times of Paganism, and allowed to remain there, adapted to Greek Christianity, is very far-fetched, and wholly at variance with my experience and knowledge of the existing monuments of Pagan origin, or of the Byzantine Empire in Turkey, and its Greek provinces. Neither can I think that any existing Byzantine remains of art alone could ever have suggested the style of structure or adornment of those marvellous gems of Moorish architecture, which I have so often gazed at with wonder and delight, in Seville and Grenada.

Mr. Loftus, in his "Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susia," denies that the Arabs had opportunities of familiarising themselves with Byzantine monuments, and that they derived their architectural notions and tastes from nations posterior to the Greeks, in Bactria, Armenia, Sogdiana, and in Asia Minor. One thing is certain, that the Arabs, whom we designate Saracens, had no architecture of their own deserving of the name, that no monuments of theirs, of any structure beyond a house of very ordinary dimensions, or a mosque of the rudest and simplest kind of a stone edifice, devoted to religious purposes, prior to the 8th century, existed in the Hedjaz, in Mecca, or Medina.

The Saracens, in all probability, were largely indebted for their architectural ideas, to the semi-civilised Arian races, with whom they came in contact in their early wars with the Persians, and their provinces in Irak and Khorassan. We find the same prevailing defects and peculiar merits in the architecture of the Arahs and Persians—want of originality of design, combined with remarkable richness and beauty, and brilliancy of polycromatic decoration.

In the 10th century the Saracen's succeeded in establishing themselves in several important fortified towns and strong-

holds in Sicily, as also on the coasts of Apulia and Calabria, where they became the terror of the Christian states on the shores of the Adriatic and Mediterranean. The Greeks, settled in Sicily and Calabria, applied in their distress to a successful Norman freebooter, who had established an independent state in Neustria in Gaul, William Guiscard, for aid and assistance against the Saracens; and, as usual, the foreign auxiliaries called in to help a people unable to defend their own country, eventually remained masters of it. The Normans first made themselves masters of a considerable portion of Apulia and Calabria, but their domination there was resisted and denounced by Pope Leo IX. But in 1053 that pontiff being defeated by the Normans, and taken prisoner by them, revoked his former measures, and gave his sanction, while in durance, to their usurped occupation of those territories.

About half a century later, in the early part of the 11th century, Roger, the son of the Norman duke, Robert, and nephew of William Guiscard, expelled the Saracens from Sicily, and having obtained the title of the King of Sicily from the See of Rome, he proceeded to avail himself of his regal privileges, and completed his conquest by the overthrow and subjugation of the independent republics of Amalfi and Naples.

The Saracenic empire became too vast for the government of a single Caliph. It broke up into various separate principalities and dynasties. In Arabia, and its borders, the Caliphs called in the Turcoman and Tartar tribes, of Scythian origin, to their aid, and were eventually mastered by their auxiliaries. Their successful leaders took the name of Sultans; after having entered into terms of peace with the Saracens and adopted their religion, they overran all the Asiatic possessions of the Western Empire. On the death of the famous Saracen prince, Saladin, Othman, of Turcoman origin, obtained the title of Sultan in Asia Minor, laid the foundation of the Turkish Empire, and gave his name to the governmental institution of the Turks—the Ottoman Porte. He lived long enough to

subdue some of the principal provinces of the Western Empire. His successors followed up his conquests and acquisitions, till nothing remained of it, to the successors of Constantine the Great, but the Imperial city of Constantinople. And when it fell into their hands in 1452, the Saracen power in the East had already been swallowed up in the Turkish empire.

For the best knowledge we possess of the Caliphs and the Saracens, we are indebted to a clergyman of the Church of England—a professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge —Simon Ockley, of "whose History of the Saracens, from original and authentic Arabic sources," in 8vo, the first volume was published in 1708, the second in 1718.* It forms no part of my design to enter at any length into the subject which has been so admirably treated by Ockley. It is only necessary for me to shew what the influence and results of the grand imposture of Mohammed was on the rule of his early successors, in the Saracenic Caliphate during its continuance under six caliphs, to the end of the Caliphate of Bagdad, and the death of the caliph Moawiyah, in 679 A.D.

The caliphs, Anglice-Vicars, who were the first successors of Mohammed, possessed the spiritual and the temporal power. No sooner was the Arch Impostor dead, than his followers and disciples began quarreling among themselves. Within thirty years of his death Mecca and Medina, Arabia and Tartary, became theatres of savage wars and sanguinary contests, between the claimants for the Caliphate, and fierce polemical opponents of various Mohammedan sects.

The Caliphate of the East was torn to pieces by dissensions in Mecca and Medina. It was set up again in Damascus, then at Bagdad. A Caliphate was also instituted in Egypt, another in Cordova. The first Caliphate of the East continued to have its seat at Mecca till the death of Ali, during a period of twenty-eight years. It was then transferred to Damascus, and established

* Ockley's History of the Saracens embraces a period of seventy-five years. It commences in 632 A.D. (from the death of Mohammed), to 705 A.D., through a succession of ten caliphs.

under the family of the Ommeides; and another Caliphate was set up in Bagdad under the family of the Abassides, and endured till the year A.D. 1258. The Caliphate of Cordova was established in 756, and was overthrown in 1031. The third Caliphate, that of Egypt, was under a Fatimite dynasty, by a descendant of Fatima daughter of Mohammed, and was overthrown by Saladin in 1171 A.D. The caliphs of the East lost their temporal dominion in 935, after the creation of the Emir-al-Omrah. They nominally existed, however, in the interim down to 1516 A.D. But from the year 940 A.D. the Caliphate was virtually at an end, after having subsisted 310 years. The caliph Rhadi (of Bagdad) (Tem. Reg. 934—940,), was the last caliph who was possessed of any considerable temporal and spiritual authority, or whose state or resources had any resemblance to those of the ancient caliphs.

First caliph (after Mohammed) Aboubeker, A.D. 632—634. The day Mahommed expired, the 8th of June, A.D. 632, at Medina, "the Companions of the Prophet assembled to elect a caliph or successor." "A hot dispute" arose between the inhabitants of Mecca and Medina, and the companions and the wives of the Prophet, "that might have utterly ruined the new religion," says Ockley, about the appointment of a successor. "In short they came to daggers drawing," before the election was made of Aboubeker, the father of Ayesha the favourite wife of Mohammed. But early as the contention was, among the wives and families of the false prophet, another tumult preceded it, occasioned by the discordancy of the opinions about the disposal of his remains. And no sooner was the election made of a sovereign Pontiff and Prince, than the new Caliphate began to be the prey of conflicting interests, jealousies, animosities, and intrigues.

The establishment of the power of the new religion was then in keeping with its birth. It was born in violence, in sordidness and selfishness, and it was settled in life with the same elements surrounding it.

"Now though the government (says Ockley) was actually

settled upon Aboubeker, all parties were not equally satisfied, for a great many were of opinion that the right of succession belonged to Ali, the son of Abu Taleb. Upon which account the Mohammedans have ever since been divided; some maintaining that Aboubeker, and Omar and Othman, that came after him, were the rightful and lawful successors of the prophet; and others disclaiming them altogether as usurpers, and constantly asserting the right of Ali. Of the former opinion are the Turks at this day; of the latter, the Persians. And that consequently is the difference between those two nations, that notwithstanding their agreement in all other points of their superstition, yet upon this account they treat one another as most damnable heretics. Ali had this to recommend him, that he was Mohammed's cousin-german, and was the first that embraced his religion, except his wife Kadija and his slave Zaid, and was besides Mohammed's son-in-law, having married his daughter Fatima."

No sooner had Aboubeker settled the new government, than he had a rebellion to deal with. "For the Mohammedan religion (we are told) had not, as yet, taken such deep root in the hearts of men, but that they would very willingly have shaken it off, had they known how." The Arabians lost no time, on the death of the prophet, of taking up arms, and refusing to pay tribute, tithes, and alms. "They no longer observed the rites and customs which had been imposed on them by Mohammed."

The new caliph Aboubeker sent an army of 4,500 men under Kaled, of subsequent celebrity in the Syrian wars, against the rebels, routed them in a pitched battle, plundered their towns, and carried off great numbers of their children as slaves. No sooner was the rebellion of the Arabs crushed, than the country was distracted with rival pretensions to those of Mohammed. Several new prophets set up in various parts of Arabia. One of these, Moseilama, had been an associate of Mohammed, and professed his religion, "And might have been a partner in his imposture (says Ockley), but considering that to be

beneath him, he renounced all further friendship and correspondence with him, and resolved to set up for himself, which he did the year before Mohammed died."

He was ever the rival of the latter in his life-time, and had concocted a book of revelations, *in imitation*, it is said, of the Koran. Sale states that Moseilama sent a communication to Mohammed to this effect: "From Moseilama, the apostle of God, to Mohammed the apostle of God. Now, let the earth be half mine and half thine." But Mohammed at that time counted on the acquisition of the whole earth, so he declined the offer of his brother knave.

Immediately after Mohammed's death, he followed the example of the deceased impostor, he took his book of revelations in one hand, and the sword in the other, and set up his standard at Yemana, a province of Arabia. The new Caliph sent an army of 40,000 men, under three commanders of note, one of whom was Kaled, against Moseilama, and his followers. Moseilama charged his enemies with such fury that he defeated them, and forced them to retire with a loss of 1,200 men. The latter, however, renewed the fight, and slew the poor prophet Moseilama, with 10,000 of his men.

The religion of Mohammed was baptised in blood, and it seems, from first to last, as if it could not survive without shedding it.

The first Caliph, Abou Beker, was not a year on his throne, when he had these wars, and several others, some of which were of vast magnitude.

Another rebellion of Mussulmans, who had lapsed from the faith, was raised, and subdued by the forces of the Caliph, in Bahrein. A great many of the rebels were killed, and separated, the rest were reconciled to the law of Islam.

"It is strange and surprising," says Ockley, "to consider from how mean and contemptible beginnings the greatest things have, by the providence of God, been raised in a short time. Of this the Saracenic empire is a remarkable instance. If we look back but eleven years, we shall see how Mohammed,

unable to support his cause, routed and oppressed by the powerful party of the Koreishites at Mecca, fled with a few desponding followers to Medina, to preserve his life no less than his imposture. Now, within so short a period, we find the undertakings of his successor prospering beyond expectation, and making himself the terror of all his neighbours; and the Saracens in a capacity not only to keep possession of their own peninsula of Arabia, but to extend their arms over larger territories than ever were subject to the Romans themselves. Whilst they were thus employed in Arabia, they were little regarded by the Grecian Emperor, who awoke too late to a sense of their formidable power, when he saw them pouring in upon them like a torrent, and driving all before them. The proud Persian, too, who so very lately had been domineering in Syria, and sacked Jerusalem and Damascus, must be forced not only to part with his own dominions, but also to submit his neck to the Saracenic yoke."

The next business, after converting and conquering nearly all Arabia, the new Caliph, Abou Beker, had to do in accordance with the law of Islam, was to make war on the infidels of neighbouring countries.

With this religious object, Abou Beker sent at this time a force under Kaled, into Irak, or Babylonia, but his greatest longing was after Syria, which delicious, pleasant, and fruitful country being near to Arabia, seemed to lie very conveniently for him.

Having raised a considerable army, he promulgated his intention "to send the true believers into Syria, to take it out of the hands of the infidels." The army of "true believers" accordingly marched towards Syria, and a second a little later under Kaled.

"The news of this preparation," says Ockley, "quickly came to the ears of the Emperor Heraclius, who forthwith called a council, in which he inveighed against the wickedness and insincerity of his subjects, telling them that these judgments were come upon them because they had not lived answerably to

the rules of the Gospel. He represented to them, that whereas, in former times, powerful princes, as the Turk and Persian, had not been able to overcome them, they were now insulted by the Arabs, a pitiful, contemptible people. Heraclius despatched a force with all possible speed to check the advance of the Saracens, but with ill-success, for the general, with twelve hundred of his men, was killed upon the field of the battle, and the rest routed, the Arabs losing only one hundred and twenty men. A number of skirmishes followed, in most of which the Christians came off the worst."

At Bostria, before its walls, vast numbers of the unfortunate Christians were slaughtered for many days by the troops of Kaled. In still greater numbers were they massacred within its gates, when the banner of the cross was torn down from the walls, and the victorious Saracens were in possession of the place. All the Saracenic forces in Palestine at this time amounted to 45,500 troops. They marched against Damascus, and all the forces the Emperor Heraclius, then at Antioch, could send to Damascus, to reinforce the garrison, was five thousand.

Damascus was besieged, and in due time, captured by the Saracens. Several bloody battles were fought before that city, and in one disastrous engagement in its vicinity, the Greek forces amounted to 70,000 men. They were entirely defeated; the fight, or rather the slaughter, which began in the morning, continued till the evening.

"The Saracens," says Ockley, "killed that day fifty thousand men. Those that escaped fled, some of them to Cæsarea, others to Damascus, and some to Antioch. The Saracens took plunder of inestimable value, and a great many banners, and crosses made of gold and silver, precious stones, silver and gold chains, rich clothes, and arms without number, which Kaled said he would not divide until Damascus was taken."

At length the besieged Damascenes sent a hundred of the chief citizens and clergy to the chief commander of the Saracens, Abou Obœidah, to propose terms of capitulation, which

were accepted, but Kaled, the other commander, at the same time was attacking the east side of the city, and having effected, through the treachery of a Christian, an entrance into the city, either ignorant or regardless of the terms of capitulation entered into.

"Kaled," says Ockley, "entered at the east gate, with his Saracens, putting all to the sword, and Christian blood flowed through the streets of Damascus." Kaled set at defiance the terms entered into with the unfortunate inhabitants. After he had been informed of the capitulation, he let loose his ferocious soldiers on the Christians, but Obœidah promptly interfered, and put an end to the infamous massacre. Thus was Damascus, the most noble and ancient city of Syria, taken by the Saracens the 23rd May A.D. 634, a few weeks less than two years from the time of Mohammed's death, the 8th of June, 632. Abou-Beker, the first caliph, died the same day that Damascus was was taken.

Second Caliph Omar Ebn Al Khattab, A.D. 634—643.

The succession of Omar was unaccompanied by tumults, Abou Beker having provided for it by his last will. He first took the title—the Caliph of the Caliph of the Apostle of God. But his advisers deeming it too long, he invented another, which should serve for all future caliphs, namely: Emir al Mumenina, "Prince of believers," used ever afterwards by all succeeding caliphs.

Omar piously began his reign by a war against the Persians in Irak. His troops were at first discomfited and compelled to retire; but soon after, being reinforced, they met the Persians at Hirah, and defeated them. In 635 the Persians sent two armies against the Saracens in Irak, both armies were defeated by the Saracens, who bore, as it would seem, a charmed life within them; in other words, to whom Providence appears to have assigned a mission of retribution and castigation.

The battle of Cadesia, or Kadise, sealed the fate of the Persian Empire. The Persian army under Amy Rustam amounted to 120,000 men; the Arabs only numbered 30,000.

For three days the battle was fought, and the victory remained undecided; and even by the night of the third day, it was continued on both sides by the light of flambeaux. Victory remained on the morning of the fourth day with the Saracens. The royal standard of Persia, a throne of state, and a vast quantity of treasure fell into their hands. The ruin of a vast portion of the Persian empire, and the defeat of the Persians in this protracted battle, took place in the year A.D. 635. A recent English writer on Indian affairs, estimated the booty at three hundred millions sterling.

In Syria, during the years, A.D. 634, 5, and 6, the progress of the Saracens was one continued series of battles, victories, and massacres of Christians. Baalbec was besieged and capitulated; Arristan was taken; Hems was besieged twice; and finally the fate of Syria was determined by the battle of Yermouk. Victory as usual was with the Saracens; the Saracen general despatched to the caliph an account of his success (as we are informed by Ockley) in a letter worthy of Cromwell:

"In the name of the most merciful God, &c.

"This is to acquaint thee that I encamped at Yermouk, where Mahan was near us, with such an army as that the Mussulmans never beheld a greater. But God, of his abundant grace and goodness, overthrew this multitude, and gave us the victory over them. We killed of them about a hundred and fifty thousand, and took forty thousand prisoners. Of the Mussulmans were killed four thousand and thirty, to whom God had decreed the honour of martyrdom. Finding some heads cut off, and not knowing whether they belonged to the Mussulmans or Christians, I prayed over them and buried them. Mahan was afterwards killed at Damascus by Nooman Ebn Alkamah. There was one Abu Joaid that before the battle had belonged to them, having come from Hems; he drowned of them a great number unknown to any but God. As for those that fled into the deserts and mountains, we have destroyed them all, and stopped all the roads and passages, and God has

made us masters of their country, and wealth, and children. Written after the victory at Damascus, where I stay expecting thy orders concerning the division of the spoil. Fare thee well, and the mercy and blessing of God be upon thee, and all the Mussulmans."

The caliph Omar next directed his generals in Syria, to proceed to Jerusalem, and besiege that city.

For four months the people of the Holy City defended that sacred place with signal courage. At length they were forced to propose terms of capitulation; but they refused to make the terms with any of the generals of the caliphs, with any one but the caliph Omar himself. Omar deemed it prudent to accept of this proposal. So he set out for the Holy City, and pitched his tent in front of the principal gate of Jerusalem, had a conference with the notabilities of the Holy City, signed the required articles, and took possession of Jerusalem. This event occurred in the year A.D. 637.

The articles were these: 1. The Christians shall build no new churches, either in the city or the adjacent territory. 2. They shall not refuse the Mussulmans entrance into their churches, either by night or day. 3. They shall set open the doors of them to all passengers and travellers. 4. If any Mussulman should be upon a journey, they shall be obliged to entertain him gratis for the space of three days. 5. They shall not teach their children the Koran, nor talk openly of their religion, nor persuade any one to be of it; neither Mohammedans if they had an inclination to it. 6. They shall pay respect to the Mussulmans, and if they were sitting rise up to them. 7. They shall not go like the Mussulmans in their dress; nor wear the same caps, shoes, nor turbans, nor part their hair as they do, nor speak after the same manner, nor be called by the names used by the Mussulmans. 8. They shall not ride upon saddles, nor bear any sort of arms, nor use the Arabic tongue in the inscriptions of their seals. 9. They shall not sell any wine. 10. They shall be obliged to keep to the same sort of habit wheresoever they went, and always wear

girdles upon their waists. 11. They shall set no crosses upon their churches, nor show their crosses nor their books openly in the streets of the Mussulmans. 12. They shall not ring but only toll their bells: nor shall they take any servant that had once belonged to the Mussulmans. 13. They shall not overlook the Mussulmans in their houses: and some say, that Omar commanded the inhabitants of Jerusalem to have the foreparts of their heads shaved, and obliged them to ride upon their pannels sideways, and not like the Mussulmans."

Upon these terms (not so bad, indeed, as those of our penal laws against Catholics) the Christians had liberty of conscience, paying such tribute as their masters thought fit to impose upon them; and Jerusalem, once the glory of the east, was forced to submit to a heavier yoke than ever it had borne before. For though the number of the slain, and the calamities of the besieged were greater when it was taken by the Romans; yet the servitude of those who survived was nothing comparable to this, either in respect of the circumstances or the duration. For however it might seem to be utterly ruined and destroyed by Titus, yet by Hadrian's time it had greatly recovered itself. Now it fell, once for all, into the hands of the most mortal enemies of the Christian religion, and has continued so ever since, with the exception of a brief interval of about ninety years, during which time it was held by the Christians in the holy war.

"The Christians (says Ockley) having submitted on these terms, Omar gave them the following writing under his own hand:

"In the name of the most merciful God.

"From Omar Ebn Al Khattab to the inabitants of Ælia. They shall be protected and secured both in their lives and fortunes, and their churches shall neither be pulled down, nor made use of by any but themselves."

Upon this the gates were immediately opened (A.D. 637), and the caliph and those that were with him marched in. The patriarch kept them company, and the caliph talked with him familiarly, and asked him many questions concerning the an-

tiquities of the place. Among other places which they visited, they went into the temple of the resurrection, and Omar sat down in the midst of it. When the time of Mohammedan prayer was come, Omar told the patriarch that he had a mind to pray, and desired him to show him a place where he might perform his devotion. The patriarch bade him pray where he was; but this he positively refused. Then taking him out from thence, the patriarch went with him into Constantine's church, and laid a mat for him to pray there, but he would not. At last he went alone to the steps which were at the east end of St. Constantine's church, and kneeled by himself upon one of them. Having ended his prayers, he sat down, and asked the patriarch if he knew why he had refused to pray in the church. The patriarch confessed that he could not tell what were his reasons. "Why, then," says Omar, "I will tell you. You know that I promised you that none of your churches should be taken away from you, but that you should possess them quietly yourselves. Now if I had prayed in any of these churches, the Mussulmans would infallibly take it away from you as soon as I had departed homeward. And notwithstanding all you might allege, they would say, this is the place where Omar prayed, and we will pray here too. And so you would have been turned out of your church, contrary both to my intention, and your expectation. But because my praying even on the steps of one, may perhaps give some occasion to the Mussulmans to cause you disturbance on this account; I shall take what care I can to prevent that." So calling for pen, ink, and paper, he expressly commanded that none of the Mussulmans should pray upon the steps in any multitudes, but one by one. . . "A noble instance of singular fidelity," says Ockley, "and the religious observance of a promise."

During the brief period that Omar remained in Jerusalem he gave orders for the rebuilding of the temple (as the mosque that bears his name is designated), on the site of that of Soliman. Before his return to Medina he disposed the affairs of Syria, after the following manner:

Syria he divided into two parts; and committed all that lies between Hauran and Aleppo to Abu Obeidah, with orders to make war upon it till he had completely subdued it. Yezid Ebn Abu Sofian was to take the charge of all Palestine and the sea-shore. Amrou Ebn Al Aas was ordered to invade Egypt, no inconsiderable part of the emperor's dominions, which were now continually mouldering away.

"In the same year that Jerusalem was taken (says Ockley), Said Ebn Abi Wakkas, one of Omar's captains, was making fearful havoc in the territories of Persia. He took Madayen, formerly the treasury and magazine of Cosroes, king of Persia; where he found money and rich furniture of all sorts, inestimable. Elmakin says, that they found there no less than three thousand million of ducats, besides Cosroes' crown and wardrobe, which was exceedingly rich, his clothes being all adorned with gold and jewels of great value. Then they opened the roof of Cosroes' porch, where they found another considerable sum. They also plundered his armory, which was well stored with all sorts of weapons. Among other things they brought to Omar a piece of silk hangings, sixty cubits square, all curiously wrought with needle-work. That it was of great value appears from the price which Ali had for that part of it which fell to his share when Omar divided it; which, though it was none of the best, yielded him twenty thousand pieces of silver. After this, in the same year, the Persians were defeated by the Saracens in a great battle near the Jaloulah. And now Yezdejird, perceiving matters grow worse every day, retired to Ferganah, a city of Persia."

Omar's generals in Syria, after his departure, proceeded to extend the Saracen conquests. They got possession of Kinnisrin and Ahadir by capitulation, took Aziaas, besieged Aleppo and Cæsarea; Aleppo and Hader surrendered to them, the castle only holding out for a short time; and finally they marched against Antioch, where the Emperor Heraclius then held his court. The Emperor, Ockley states, having no hopes left of defending the city, acting on the advice of his counsellors,

assembled in the great church, bishops, and principal officers of state, took measures for the assassination of the Caliph, Omar, with the view of embroiling the affairs of the Saracens in Syria. An assassin, a Christian Arab, was engaged to undertake this crime, proceeded to Mecca to accomplish it, but was struck with remorse on finding Omar asleep in his garden, a lion walking round the Caliph, and licking his feet from time to time. The would-be assassin hereupon repented of his criminal intention, and made Omar acquainted with his mission. This statement is made on the authority of the Arabian writers, and in all probability is a Saracenic invention, devised to stimulate and palliate the barbarities committed on the Christians in Syria. The people of Antioch, after a long siege, surrendered, on the 1st of August, 638, to the Saracens, paying down three hundred thousand crowns, to their general, Abou Odedah, the Emperor Heraclius and his court having previously fled to Constantinople. Tripoli and Tyre were next surprised and taken by treachery. Cæsarea, after a protracted siege, by Amrou (the future conqueror of Egypt), and the flight of the Emperor's son, Constantine, capitulated the same year, A.D. 638.

"After the taking of Cæsarea all the other places in Syria which as yet held out, namely Ramlah, Acre, Joppa, Ascalon, Gaza, Sichem (or Nablös), and Tiberias surrendered, and in a little time after, the people of Beiro Zidon, Jabalah, and Laodicea, followed their example; so that there remained nothing more for the Saracens to do in Syria, who, in little more than six years from the time of their first expedition, in Abou Beker's reign, had succeeded in subduing the whole of that large, wealthy, and populous country."

The year following a terrible pestilence among men and cattle raged in Syria; the new possessors of the land lost 25,000 men in that "year of destruction," as the Arian writers term it.

Amrou, having remained longer than he was instructed to do in Syria, prepared for his Egyptian expedition, in obedience to

the Caliph's instructions. He was superseded, however, in his command, whilst he was actually on his route, and ordered to return, provided the letter of recall reached him before he should arrive in Egypt; but, in the contrary event, he was to remain in Egypt, and do the best he could.

Amrou was met by the messenger in Syria, and either suspecting, or having secret intelligence of his recall, declined to open the letter of the Caliph till his arrival at El Arish, and immediately proceeded with all possible dispatch, to Egypt.

From Al Arish, he and his army of Arabians proceeded to Farma, called by some Farama, and Faramia, the Saracen name for the ancient Pelusium, which he took after a month's siege; from thence to Misrah (formerly Memphis, now Cairo,), situate on the western bank of the river Nilus, and which had been the seat of the ancient Egyptian kings. This place the Greeks had fortified, as being, after Alexandria, the most considerable in all that kingdom. The castle, though old, was of great strength. About it the Greeks had dug a large moat or trench, into which they threw great quantities of nails and iron spikes, to make it more difficult for the Mussulmans to pass. Amrou, with four thousand men laid hard siege to it; but after closely investing it for about seven months without effect, he was obliged to send to the Caliph for fresh supplies, who, with all speed, reinforced him with four thousand more. The prefect, or lieutenant of Misrah, who held it for the Emperor Heraclius, was one Mokaukas, of the sect of the Jacobites, and a mortal enemy to the Greeks.

Amrou, by the treachery of the Governor of Al Masr, or Cairo, who held the castle and city for the Greek servant, gained possession of both.

The conditions of peace were settled previously by private treaty.

"It was settled between them," says Ockley, "that all the Copts who lived both above and below Cairo, rich or poor, without any difference or distinction, should pay yearly two ducats; boys under sixteen years of age, decrepid old men, and

all women, being exempt. The number of the Copts, as they were then polled, was six millions, according to which account, the yearly tribute of Cairo, and the neighbouring territory, amounted to twelve millions of ducats. Mokaukas begged of Amrou that he might be reckoned among the Copts, and taxed as they were; declaring that he desired to have nothing in common with the Greeks, for he was none of them, nor of their religion, but that he had only for a while dissembled for fear of his life; and entreated him never to make peace with the Greeks, but to persecute them to death; and, lastly, desiring that when he died he might be buried in St. John's church, in Alexandria. All this Amrou promised to perform, upon condition that the Copts should entertain for three days gratis, any Mussulman whatsoever who had occasion to pass through the country; and also repair two bridges, which were broken, and provide quarters for himself and his army, and take care that the country people should bring in provisions to the camp, and open the road from Cairo to Alexandria (which he was then going to besiege), by building such bridges as were necessary for the march of the army. These terms were readily accepted by the Copts, who assisted them with everything they wanted. Amrou marched on without interruption till he came to Keram'l Shoraik, where the Greeks that fled from Cairo were posted. Here they fought three days successively; but at last the Greeks were forced to give way. He had also some other battles to fight before he came to Alexandria, but in all of them the Saracens were invariably victors. Those Greeks who escaped retired to Alexandria, where they made the best preparation they could for a siege.

"Amrou was not long after them, but quickly came up, and laid siege to the city. However, the Greeks made a stout resistance, and made frequent sallies, so that there was a great slaughter on both sides. The Saracens at last made a vigorous assault upon one of the towers, and succeeded in entering it, the Greeks all the while defending it with the utmost bravery. In the tower itself the fight was sustained so long and stoutly,

that the Saracens were at last hard pressed, and forced to retire. In this attempt Amrou, the general, Muslemah Ebn Al Mochalled, and Werdan, Amrou's slave, were taken prisoners."

Fortunately for the captured Saracens, the rank of the general was ignored by the governor, and in a capricious fit of generosity he set at liberty all the prisoners.

"To secure his conquest, and to prevent any alarm or disturbance which might follow, Amrou thought it advisable to reduce those Greeks who had escaped from the siege of Alexandria, and gone further up into the country. For he reasonably concluded that so long as any considerable number of them should be in arms, the Saracens would not be allowed to enjoy their new possessions in peace and security. With this design, therefore, he marched out of Alexandria, leaving but a few of his Saracens behind him in the town, as apprehending no danger on that side. During his absence, the Greeks who at the taking of the town had gone aboard their ships, and of whose return there was not the least fear or suspicion, came back on a sudden, and surprising the town, killed all the Saracens that were in it. The news of this event quickly came to Amrou's ear, and he immediately returned to Alexandria with the greatest speed, and found there the Greeks who had put back from sea in possession of the castle. They gave him a warm reception, and fought bravely. At last, unable to hold out any longer against his superior numbers, they were obliged to retire to their ships again, and try their fortune at sea once more, leaving Amrou and his Saracens in full and quiet possession. This done, Amrou acquainted the caliph with his success.

"The metropolis, and the inhabitants compounded for their lives, fortunes, and free exercise of their religion, at the price of two ducats a head yearly. This head-money was to be paid by all without distinction, except in the case of a man holding land, farms, or vineyards, for in such cases he paid proportionably to the yearly value of what he held. This tax brought in a most prodigious revenue to the caliph. After the Saracens

were once arrived at this pitch, it is no wonder if they went further, for what would not such a revenue do in such hands?

"Amrou found few applicants for the renowned library of Alexandria. An eminent Alexandrian scholar, however, named John the Grammarian, addressed himself to Amrou, soliciting the books of the library to be given up to him, seeing that the Arab general and his army set no value on them. The caliph Omar returned this answer:—'What is contained in these books you mention is either agreeable to what is written in the book of God (meaning the Koran), or it is not. If it be, then the Koran is sufficient without them; if otherwise, it is fit they should be destroyed.'"

"I have taken," writes Amrou to the caliph "the great city of the west. It is impossible for me to enumerate the variety of its riches and beauty; and I shall content myself with observing, that it contains four thousand palaces, four thousand baths, four hundred theatres or places of amusement, twelve thousand shops for the sale of vegetable food, and forty thousand tributary Jews. The town has been subdued by force of arm, without treaty or capitulation, and the Mussulmans are impatient to seize the fruits of their victory."—*Eutychius, as quoted by Gibbon.*

"Amrou in obedience to the caliph's command, distributed the books throughout all the city, amongst those that kept warm baths (of which there was at that time no fewer than four thousand in Alexandria), to heat the baths with. And notwithstanding the great havoc that must needs be made of them at this rate, yet the number of books which the diligence of former princes had collected was so great, that it was six months before they were consumed. A loss never to be made up to the learned world!"

Ockley takes his account of this barbarous act from Abulfaragius. Several English writers in their zeal for the honour and glory of the Saracens, have been not only like Gibbon "strangely attempted to deny" the barbarous edict of Omar and act of Amrou, but are stout in their denial of both.

But there can be no reasonable doubt of the fact. What object could the Arab writers have in inventing it? And yet several of them besides Abulfaragius, referred to by Oriental historians of a late date record it. These writers satisfy eminent German and French oriental scholars, who have carefully examined the matter. Von Hammer (one of the first scholars in Europe), and Silvester de Lacy, considered the destruction of the Alexandrian Library, by Omar's order, beyond dispute. It is to be observed this act was done in the twenty-first year of the Hegira, A.D. 641, only nine years after the death of Mohammed. We know by the Impostor's own admissions in the Koran, that he could neither read nor write. The same fact is averred by the Arab commentators on the Koran, by the most ancient of them, as well as the most renowned of a later date. It is taken and dealt with as an established fact by Marracci, Sale, Prideaux, and Ockley.* Nay, it is stated that amongst *the inhabitants* of Mecca in the time of Mohammed, there was only one person who could either read or write. There was no tincture of literature or taste for letters eleven years after his decease, in the time of caliph Omar, existing among the Saracens. Nor till a much later period, when their principal conquests, made in the time of Abou Beker and Omar, the acquisition of all Arabia, the greater part of Syria and Mesopotamia; the principal territories of Persia; all Palestine, Phœnicia, and Egypt, were settled and their power was consolidated in them. It was not till nearly a century after the death of Mohammed, that learning and science could be said to be at all appreciated by the Saracens, and found their first patron in the caliph Al Mansur. Nay, "for about 200 years," says Ockley, "little else was cared for but war, except what concerned the interpretation of the Koran, and the sects and divisions among themselves which arose therefrom daily multiplied. But till then, while the Saracens were an illiterate people, simple in their manners,

* "Mohammed who it is agreed on all hands could neither read nor write."—*Ockley's Hist. of the Saracen Invasion.*

temperate and frugal in their habits, utter strangers to luxury in any shape, form, or garb, they were not only sincere believers in their religion, but strict in their observances of it to the letter of the law. In the time of Omar the Saracens might have overrun the world; as it was they had conquered, in the space of thirty years, more territory than the Romans had done in four centuries.

The burning of the library of Alexandria could not have been done in the times of caliphs Al Mansur or Al Mamun, when literature and luxury had their usual effects and influences on their faith, as well as their manners. But on Saracens of the time of Omar, strong, simple, and sincere, in their fanaticism, it was an act of religious duty, in accordance with the spirit of the Koran, to destroy *infidelity and idolatry* wherever they found it, however enshrined, in human flesh, in piles of stone, or books.

Dr. W. C. Taylor, in his "History of Mohammedanism and its Sects" (Lon. 1834, p. 175), on this subject observes:

"His strictness in enforcing religious ordinances was carried to the very extreme of fanaticism; by his orders the splendid library which the Ptolemy's had collected at Alexandria, was burnt to heat the public baths; and the invaluable records of Persia, assembled by the zeal of the Sassanides in Modain, were hurled into the waters of the Tigris."

In the meantime Amrou being now possessed of Egypt, began to look a little further towards the western part of Africa; and in a short time made himself master of all that country which lies between Barcah and Zeweilah; the inhabitants of Barcah bringing in the tribute imposed upon them punctually at the time prefixed, without going among them to gather it.

And here an important event is recorded in connexion with a great dearth in Arabia at this period, which induced Omar to give orders to his lieutenant Amrou to furnish the Arabians with corn from Egypt.

"This Amrou did so abundantly (says Ockley), that the

train of camels which were loaded with it, reached in a continued line from Egypt to Medina; the foremost of them entering Medina, before the last of the caravans was yet out of the bounds of Egypt. But this way of conveying the provision being both tedious and expensive, the caliph commanded Amrou to dig a passage from the Nile to the Red Sea, for the more speedy and easy conveyance of their provision to the Arabian shore. Shortly after this Amrou took Tripoli. If we consider the extent of his success, it alone is great enough to command our admiration even though nothing else had been accomplished in any other part. But in the east, also, their victorious arms made no less progress, and the Mohammedan crescent now began to shed its malignant influence upon as large and considerable dominions, as the Roman eagle ever soared over."

In the very period of this great dearth, Omar's forces were bringing new regions under subjection to the Saracen, in the year of the Hegira 21, A.D. 641, Narran, Chorassan, Nisibin Rakka, Ehwas, Aderbyan, were subdued. And now, when the old caliph Omar was full of glory, had accomplished greater things than his predecessors, or any of his successors, the angel of death hovered over his humble dwelling, and a Persian assassin was skulking in its chambers. He was slain by this Persian of the sect of the Magi, in the twenty-third year of the Hegira, A.D. 643. He was a stern, but a just ruler of his people, disposed to be clement in his wars with Christians. A man of heroic aspirations, and of great constancy in the execution of his grand projects of raides and rapine for his religion's sake, not for his own interests or advantage.

"The conquests gained by the Saracens in his reign (says Ockley) were so considerable, that though they had never been extended, the countries they had subdued would have made a very formidable empire. He drove all the Jews and Christians out of Arabia; subdued Syria, Egypt, and other territories in Africa, besides the greater part of Persia."

He built two magnificent mosques, one in Jerusalem, and

another in Medina. He ordered public works of vast magnitude to be undertaken: the opening of the canal, for instance, between the Red Sea and the Nile.

The vast riches acquired in Persia by his armies, had no influence over his habits and mode of life. And yet they were enough to dazzle the senses, and corrupt the heart of the most civilized of conquerors. An eminent writer thus speaks of the spoil of the Persians at the hand of the Arabians, after the defeat of the former at the battle of Radisi in 635:

"The naked robbers of the desert were suddenly enriched beyond the measure of their hope or knowledge. Each chamber revealed a new treasure secreted with art, or ostentatiously displayed; the gold and silver, the various wardrobes and precious furniture, surpassed the estimate of fancy or numbers."

From the epoch of the Hegira (A.D. 632), when the Arabians began to propagate their religion with the sword, to the death of Omar in 643, twenty-two years had not elapsed, and in that brief space of time the Nomad tribes of naked robbers of the desert, and miserable dwellers in hovels, hardly deserving the name of houses, in Mecca and Medina, and the adjacent Arab towns and villages merged into mighty armies, commanded by valiant and able generals, and they overrun and overwhelmed Christian territories of vast extent, and those of an ancient empire, that had been ruled by Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes, the terror of whose arms had been felt in Greece, before the empire of Constantine was founded in the east; they conquered that land of Egypt that had been the possession of the Pharoahs, and the prey of the Ptolemy's, whose masters had been the masters of the world, the antiquity of whose monuments was of an ancient date in the time of Herodotus.

Truly the right hand of the Lord of Hosts, of Divine retribution, is to be seen in this wonderful work of greatness and aggrandizement, suddenly attained and achieved by hordes of the Arabian deserts, by illiterate and uncivilized inhabitants of insignificant towns, whose names were then hardly known in Christendom; and of ruin and destruction precipitated all at

once on a whole Christian province, on all the Christians dwellings in Arabia, and Mesopotamia, in Persia and Armenia, on the borders of Asia Minor, on the shores of the Mediterranean, and on the coast of Africa.

Othman, third Caliph after Mohammed, A.D. 643—655.—During the three days that Omar survived his wound, his friends constantly importuned him to name a successor. All their efforts were in vain. Like Mohammed he manifested an evident disinclination to take a step in his last illness, which brought the image of death too close to his eyes. He only escaped from their solicitation by recommending them, three days after his death, to appoint six grave persons to select a fit person to fill the vacant office of the caliphate. He was strongly urged to appoint Ali the son-in-law of Mohammed, but Omar objected, alleging that he was not sufficiently serious for so solemn an office as that of caliph.

Omar being dead, in conformity with his instructions, the six persons appointed to select his successor, made choice of Othman Ebn Affan.

Othman, true to the principles of Islam, and faithful to his religion, began his reign by collecting an army to enlarge the borders of his dominions. The genius of Mohammedanism is ever prompting its votaries to shed blood, to fight and vanquish infidels, to plunder and spoil Jews, Christians, and idolaters. He greatly extended his former conquests in Ispahan and in Syria, and his lieutenant, Moawiyah, invaded the territories of the Greek emperor, took a great many towns, and wasted the country. Othman's great vice was, a disposition to favour his friends, without any regard to public interests, or the merits of those he displaced, to make room for his *protegés*. He deposed Amrou the conqueror of Egypt for no assignable cause, and appointed another to his place, because the latter was his foster brother. No sooner was the new lieutenant of Egypt appointed, than Othman despatched an army of twenty-thousand Arabs, from Medina to Memphis, on an expedition for the final reduction of Africa, from the Nile to the Atlantic.

This project of Othman was put into execution by one of his generals, Abdallah; he proceeded from Memphis to Tripoli at the head of forty thousand Arabs, and there he defeated one hundred thousand Roman troops, and Moorish, or barbarian, auxiliaries. The general of the Greek emperor, who commanded this force, Gregory, was slain in the action. In the meantime Amrou had not long been deposed from his command in Egypt, before Alexandria, which he had captured four years previously, fell again into the hands of the Greeks. The loss of Amrou was now felt by the caliph, and repenting his conduct to that successful general he reinstated him in the lieutenancy of Egypt. Amrou's first act on his restoration to power, was to besiege Alexandria with a large force, and after an obstinate defence on the part of the Greeks, the unfortunate city was taken, the walls and fortifications were entirely dismantled. From that time, this most flourishing city, once the metropolis of Egypt, dwindled away and declined apace; so that in a short period there was little belonging to it that was worth taking notice of besides its excellent haven, and its ruins.

About this time, Moawiyah invaded Cyprus, which shortly capitulated, the Saracen general agreeing to share the revenues of the island with the Grecian emperor. By this agreement the Cyprians engaged themselves to pay seven thousand and two hundred ducats yearly to Moawiyah, and the like sum to the emperor. The Mohammedans enjoyed this tribute near two years, and were then dispossessed by the Christians.

The same year that Moawiyah agreed with the Cyprians, Othman sent Abdullah Ebn Amir and Said Ebn Al Aas to invade Khorassan; and, to stimulate their enthusiasm, told them "That whoever got there first should have the prefecture of that territory." They took a great many strong places, and so straitened Yezdejird, that the Persian king, so far from being able to meet the Saracens in open field was obliged to fly from fortress to fortress to save himself. And that nothing should be wanted to complete his misery, he was at last be-

trayed by a treacherous servant, a calamity which often befalls princes in adversity.

Yezdejird, being distressed on all sides, called in Tarchan, the Turk, to his assistance, who accordingly came with an army. But the Turk's stay was short, for Yezdejird, taking offence at some trifle, sent Tarchan back again. In this desperate circumstance he could have done nothing more imprudent.

Sir John Malcolm, in his account of the battle that ensued between the Arabs and the Persians, in his History of Persia, says:

"Thirty thousand Persians were pierced by their lances, and eighty thousand more were drowned in the deep trench by which they had surrounded their camp. Their general, Firouzan, with four thousand men, fled to the hills; but such was the effect of terror on one side, and of confidence on the other, that the chief was pursued, defeated, and slain, by a body of not more than one thousand men. The battle of Nahavund decided the fate of Persia; which, from its date, fell under the dominion of the Arabian caliphs. Yezdejird protracted for several years, a wretched and precarious existence. He first fled to Seistan, then to Khorassan, and lastly to Merv. The governor of that city invited the Khan of the Tartars to take possession of the person of the fugitive monarch. That sovereign accepted the offer; his troops entered Merv, the gates of which were opened to them by the treacherous governor, and made themselves masters of it, in spite of the desperate resistance of the surprised, but brave and enraged inhabitants. Yezdejird escaped on foot from the town during the confusion of the contest. He reached a mill, eight miles from Merv, and entreated the miller to conceal him. The man told him he owed a certain sum to the owner of the mill, and that, if he paid the debt, he should have his protection against all pursuers. The monarch agreed to this proposal; and after giving his sword and belt as pledges of his sincerity, he retired to rest with perfect confidence in his safety. But the miller could not

resist the temptation of making his fortune by the possession of the rich arms and robes of the unfortunate prince, whose head he separated from his body with the sword he had received from him, and then cast his corpse into the water-course."

"Thus the Persian government was entirely destroyed and all the territories belonging to it fell into the hands of the caliph in the thirty-first year year of the Hejirah, which began on the twenty-third day of August, in the year of our Lord 651."

From the time of the death of Mohammed, the destiny of Islam was the realization of the views of the author of the Koran, a *regime* of sword law, a reign of blood, a state of war, the natural state of Mohammedanism.

This predominance of strife and tumult in the common course of things in Mohammedan life, had commenced before the remains of the impostor were consigned to the grave.

From that period, to the time of the caliph Othman, we find the widows of the dead prophet, apparently the ministers of retribution, charged with the accomplishment of that doom. We find one of the fifteen or nineteen wives of the prophet—Ayesha, the favourite wife—frequently interfering in the affairs of the caliphs, causing rebellious mutinies and massacres, the murders of two caliphs, of Othman, and a little later of Ali, the son-in-law of the Impostor, by a daughter of another of his wives, a hated rival of Ayesha. So Islamism from the time of the death of Mohammed, was torn by dissensions: the sword never departed from the house of his successors. And that institution of polygamy which he pretended the angel Gabriel revealed to him, as one in conformity with the will of heaven, was mainly instrumental to the strife and bloodshed which brought the Caliphate to ruin.

The caliph Othman had fewer bad qualities than most of the Saracen magnates of his time. The weakness of his character, which led to an undue amount of favour and affection being shewn to members of his own family, all posts of importance and emolument being given to them, and for them taken away from old servants of the State, some of them men of signal

merit, was the cause of his ruin. Advantage was taken of the mildness of his nature, and indisposition to harsh measures, to get up parties against him, not only in Mecca and Medina, but conspiracies in the provinces, especially in Egypt, and a military revolt at Cufa. Bodies of troops were sent by the conspirators from Egypt, Cufa, and Bassorah, in the thirty-fourth year of the Hegira, *to represent* their grievances to the caliph at Medina. The people of Medina opposed their entrance into the holy city. Their grievances, however, were represented to the caliph from their camp outside the walls, and redressed, of course, by the terrified old man, as far as removals from office of certain obnoxious governors, abundant promises, a great deal of gold, and the mediation of Ali could effect that object. The civil insurgents and military malcontents then suffered themselves to be appeased, and marched back to Cufa. But the rancour of the enemies of the caliph at Medina was not to be appeased except by his blood. They found means to induce his secretary Merwan to forge letters in the caliph's name, and to affix to them his seal, commanding the death of Mohammed, a great favourite in the army, a son of Aboubeker, the first of the family of Mohammed who publicly espoused his cause, and enjoining the performance of this act in a base and treacherous manner.

This perfidious act of Merwan's appears incomprehensible to the Arab historians, for ultimately he evinced attachment to his old master, and even lost his life in defending the besieged house of the caliph. But the influence that was to bear on him, there is reason to believe, was exercised by a woman who had never ceased to embroil the affairs of the caliphate since the death of her husband the prophet—Ayesha.

"Nothing (says Ockley) was omitted by the caliph's enemies which might foment and keep alive the prejudices which the people had already conceived against him. Ayesha, Mohammed's widow, was his mortal enemy. Certainly it would much better have become one that pretended to have been the wife of an inspired prophet, to have spent the days of her widowhood

in devotion and good works, than in doing mischief and embroiling the state. But she was so prejudiced in favour of Telha, the son of Zobeir, whom she would fain have raised to the dignity of caliph, that no consideration of virtue or decency could hinder her from doing everything in her power to compass the death of Othman. Another of his greatest enemies was Mohammed Aboubeker's son, the same whom the Egyptians had desired for their prefect. But none did him more harm than Merwan Ebn Al Hhakem, his own secretary, who may justly be looked upon as the principal cause of his ruin, which his enemies at last effected."

The forged letter was despatched in such a manner, the route and transmission so arranged, that it could not fail to fall into the hands of the Egyptian soldiers on their return to head quarters, from Medina, accompanied by their new lieutenant Mohammed, the son of Aboubeker, whose death was commanded in this missive, bearing the name and seal of the caliph. Mohammed's indignation, and that of his soldiers may be easily conceived.

They returned to Medina; the news of the discovery of the intended act of perfidy, attributed to the caliph, soon spread over the country. From various quarters discontented Arab chiefs and bands of Arab men flocked to Medina, and the universal cry of the insurgent soldiery and excited rabble was, "Death to the treacherous caliph."

"At last (says Ockley), they besieged him in his own house. Othman, in the meantime offered to make them every satisfaction that could reasonably be demanded, and declared his repentance for what he had done amiss. But all in vain; they were resolved to be revenged on one, who in truth had never designed to injure them. When he saw himself reduced to this strait, he sent for his cousin Ali, and asked him, 'If he had a desire to see his cousin murdered, and his own kingdom rent in pieces?' Ali answered, 'By no means;' and upon this sent his two sons, Hasan and Hosein, to defend him, and keep the gate to protect him from violence. I am verily persuaded that Ali

did not mean any harm personally to the caliph; still, whether the prospect of succeeding him made him loth to disoblige the Mussulmans, who were altogether set against Othman, or from some other reason, it is plain that he did not assist him with that zeal and vigour, which might otherwise have been expected. It is true, he sent Hasan and Hosein, but they when the besiegers had straitened the caliph, by cutting off his supply of water, left him to their mercy. Then Mohammed, Abou Beker's son, and Ammar Ebn Yaser, with several others, entered the house, where they found the caliph with the Koran in his lap. They immediately fell upon him, and one of them wounded him in the throat with a dart, a second stabbed him with his sword. As soon as he fell another sat upon his breast, and wounded him in nine places. Thus died Othman (in A.D. 655), the third after Mohammed, when he was eighty-two years old, and after having reigned nearly twelve. Authors differ concerning the time of his being besieged in his house; but it seems to have been about six weeks. His corpse lay unburied for three days; at last it was removed (by whose order I find not) bloody as it was, and buried in the same clothes he was killed in, without so much as being washed, and without the least funeral solemnity. A remarkable instance of the vanity of human greatness, and the uncertainty of all worldly felicity."

Ockley says that Caliph Othman's mode of life and conduct was not ill for a Saracen. "He was exact and regular in the performance of his religious exercises, fasting very often, and being frequent in reading and meditating on the Koran. His charity was unbounded, his riches very great."

So, in the short space of twenty-three years from the time of the death of the pseudo-prophet Mohammed, we have three caliphs, duly elected and appointed his legitimate successors, having sovereign authority in all matters appertaining to religion, and to civil government; and from first to last of these caliphs, we have dissensions, discord, jealousy, strife, and schism reigning in the seat of government, in the provinces

they conquered, at home and abroad, tumults and turbulence—peace nowhere—not even in the caliph's home, nor in private families in the holy city. The first caliph after Mohammed, had seditions and schisms to encounter, over which he triumphed by abundance of bloodshed.

The second caliph after Mohammed was engaged during his caliphate in shedding blood in Persia and Syria, and he perished by the hand of an assassin.

The third caliph after Mohammed was likewise engaged in foreign wars, shedding the blood of Christians in Egypt and Syria, by his lieutenants: he, too, had to encounter civil war, mutiny, and rebellion, and to die by the hands of his rebellious subjects and soldiers.

Ali, son-in-law and cousin of Mohammed, the son of Abou Taleb, Fourth Caliph after Mohammed. A.D. 655—661.

The bands of seditious soldiers, and hordes of armed Arabs who had joined the former as auxiliaries in the late revolt, and murder of the Caliph Othman, refused to leave Medina before a new caliph was appointed. As there were several candidates, and numerous factions, each endeavouring to secure the election of some person put forward by them, and as many intrigues as there were candidates and factions, the decision of the electors was long delayed; but when the mutinous soldiery became impatient, and signified to the grave sheiks and chiefs of El Islam, the surviving friends and companions of the prophet, that "they would put the candidates to death if they did not speedily agree among themselves, and fix upon some one or other," nothing could exceed the promptness and unanimity that was inspired by this simple intimation of the will and pleasure of the soldiery.

There was a majority of voices, at length, in favor of Ali; several of the candidates came and entreated of him to accept the caliphate. He expressed his unwillingness to undertake the office, and to numerous appeals and remonstrances to the same effect, he made the same reply, but signified his willingness to act as vizier to any person who was appointed to the

vacant office. Another intimation was hereupon made to the chief authorities of the city, by the soldiery, to the effect that if a caliph was not elected the day following they would put the three candidates, Telha, Zobeir, and Ali, to the sword. Ali was so urgently pressed by the authorities to consent to be elected, that he at length acceded to their wishes, but evidently with sincere reluctance, and bad forebodings of the event.

The two rival candidates were his implacable foes, though professing to be his friends, and when he became caliph were solicitous to be employed by him as his lieutenants, Telha in the government of Cufa, and Zobeir in that of Bassorah. Telha and Zobeir were confidential friends and agents of Ayesha, the favourite wife of Mohammed, who was then in Mecca, but who exercised great influence, not only there, but in Medina. All that influence was hostile to Ali. At the time of the death of Mohammed, Ayesha was the youngest and best beloved of his then existing wives, nine in number. But Ayesha, at the period of Ali's elevation to the caliphate, was no longer young. She had been then a widow twenty-three years, and was probably not under twenty-three at the time of the death of Mohammed, so that she could not be less than forty-six years of age in the year A.D. 655.

The impostor's widow, Ayesha, was a termagent of the first order, a turbulent, fussy, intriguing woman, who arrogated to herself a vast deal of importance from her former position in the harem of Mohammed, as a favourite wife—one of the largest portions of the fifteen component parts of the connubial felicity of the deceased prophet. This remorseless, virulent, vindictive woman, worthy of a place in Arabian mythology with the Ates, and Hecates of the antiquity, from the time of Ali's elevation to the dignity of caliph, lost no opportunities in stirring up jealousies, animosities, and suspicions for the purpose of ruining a cousin of her husband, who had married that husband's daughter Fatimah, by a younger wife than Ayesha and her detested rival.

"The ambition of Moawiyah was less effectual (says Ockley) in

securing the destruction of Ali, than the hatred of Ayesha, which even during the life-time of Mohammed, and her father, Abou Beker, she had vowed against him. When, in the sixth year fo the Hegira, during the prophet's expedition against the tribe of Mostalek, Ayesha the chaste, having wandered from the line of march with Sofwan, the son of Moattel, had given rise to certain calumnies, Ali was one of the many who, by their doubts and conjectures, rendered the title of chaste so problematical, that it was necessary to have a Sura descend from heaven to hush report, and rescue the honour of Ayesha and the prophet. Henceforward, by the authority of the sacred Scripture of Islamism, she passed for a model of immaculate purity. Eighty calumniators fell immediately beneath the sword of justice; but Ali was destined, at a later period, to atone for his incautious scepticism, with his throne and his life. Aeysha led her two generals, Telha and Sobeir, against him, and by her presence inflamed them to the combat in which they perished. A part of his troops refused to fight, and declared aloud for the opponents. They were afterwards called Khavaredj (the Deserters), and formed a powerful sect, equally hostile with the Motazeli, to the interests of the family of the prophet: but professing many tenets, differing again from theirs. At the second battle of Saffain, Moawiyah caused the Koran to be carried on the points of lances, in the van of his army. After the action near Neheran, Ali's compulsory abdication took place at Dowmetol-Jendel, which was shortly after succeeded by his assassination. Thus the caliphate, contrary to the order of hereditary succession, came, by means of murder and rebellion, into the family of Ommia, thirty years after Mohammed had prescribed that space of time as the period of its duration.

Ali, shortly after his election, appointed new governors to most of the provinces.

When Sahul, his governor, came to Tabuk, he met a party of horse, who requiring him to give an account of himself, he answered, that he was the governor of Syria. They told him that if any one else except Othman had sent him, he might go

back again about his business. Upon this he demanded if they had not been informed of the fate of Othman? and they replied, "Yes." Accordingly, perceiving that there was no room for him there, he returned to Ali. In the same manner, when Kais came into Egypt, he was opposed by a party of the Othmanians, who refused to submit to Ali's government, till justice was done to the murderers of Othman.

The Separatists in the meantime, that nothing might be wanting which could possibly give disturbance to Ali's government, carried the bloody shirt in which Othman was murdered into Syria; where they made a good use of it. At times it was spread upon the pulpit in the mosque; and at others carried about in the army. To inflame the matter still more, the fingers of Othman's wife, which were cut off at the time that he was murdered, were pinned upon the shirt. This object, daily exposed to view, exasperated the Syrian army, who were greatly indebted to Othman's munificence. Clamorous for revenge, they called impatiently for justice on his murderers. And they, indeed, were in good earnest; but there was less sincerity with the others who joined in the cry. For Ayesha, Telha, and Zobeir, who had always been enemies to Othman, and were, in fact, the contrivers of his death and destruction, when they saw Ali elected, whom they hated equally, if not more, made use of Othman's real and sincere friends as instruments of their malice against the new caliph.

Whilst Ali was making preparations for war in Syria against Moawiyah, information arrived of the revolt of Telha, Zobeir, and Ayesha, who had formed a powerful faction against him at Mecca. For all the malcontents, particularly those of the house of Ommiyah, which was Othman's family, made common cause with the deposed governors: and having at their head the prophet's widow, who had declared openly against Ali, they assembled considerable forces, and resolved upon a war. Telha and Zobeir, having acquainted the faction at Mecca with the unsettled condition of Ali's affairs at Medina, Ayesha wished to persuade them to march thither directly, and strike at the

very root. Others were of opinion that it was better to join the Syrians. However, upon consideration, Moawiyah appeared sufficiently strong to secure that part of the country without their aid. At last, however, they resolved upon an expedition against Bassorah, where Telha was represented to have a strong interest. Accordingly, the following proclamation was made about the streets of Mecca:—"The mother of the faithful (Ayesha), and Telha and Zobeir are going in person to Bassorah. Whoever, therefore, is desirous of strengthening the religion, and is ready to fight, to revenge the death of Othman, even if he has no convenience of riding, let him come." They mounted six hundred volunteers upon the like number of camels; they then went out of Mecca between nine hundred and a thousand strong: but the numbers who joined them in their march, soon swelled their armament to three thousand. Ayesha had been presented by Menbah with a camel, whose name was Alascar (which in the Arabic language signifies "the army"), which had cost its owner a hundred pieces (about fifty pounds of our money). Mounted upon this camel, in a litter, she headed the forces in their march from Mecca towards Bassorah. In their route, as they came to a rivulet called Jowab, on the side of which there was a village of the same name, all the dogs of the latter came running out in a body, and fell a barking at Ayesha; who thereupon, in great amazement, immediately asked the name of the place. Being informed that it was called Jowab, she quoted that versicle of the Koran, which is frequently made use of in cases of imminent danger—"We are resigned unto God, and to him we have recourse." She then declared she would not stir a step further that day, for she had heard the prophet say when he was travelling with his wives, "I wish I had known it, and they should have lodged within the barking of the dogs of Jowab." Besides that, he had told her formerly that one of his wives should at some time or other be barked at by the dogs of this place; that she ought to take care and lodge there, because, if she went on, she would find herself in a bad condition, and in very great danger.

Hereupon she struck her camel upon the leg to make him kneel, in order that she might alight, being resolved to stay there all night. Telha and Zobeir did not know what to make of this whimsical proceeding, and knowing of what importance it was for them to hasten their march, as having very good reason to think that Ali would not be long after them, they told her, having suborned fifty witnesses to swear to it, that it was a mistake of the guide, and that that place had never been called by any such name. But all to no purpose; she would not stir. At last one of them cried out, "Quick, quick, yonder comes Ali;" upon which they all scampered off immediately, and made the best of their way to Bassorah.

Othman, who was Ali's governor in that place, made but a weak resistance. After a slight skirmish, in which he lost forty men, he was taken prisoner. They tore out by the roots his beard and eyebrows, and after a short confinement dismissed him.

One of the Arabian authors gives us a few more particulars. Ayesha, he says, wrote to Othman at Bassorah, and to the rest of the provinces, calling upon them to revenge the death of Othman; magnifying his good qualities, and applauding (as she always had done since his death) the sincerity of his repentance, and the barbarity of the murder; and inveighing against his enemies, as having violated and trampled upon the most sacred obligations. Othman sent two messengers to her. She gave them a hearing, and answered them in similar terms to her letter. When they returned and made their report the Bassorians were in confusion. In the meantime Ayesha, advancing nearer, the Bassorians went out to meet her; and they that were so inclined went over to her. The rest had a parley; in which Telha began first, and harangued the people in praise of Othman; he was seconded by Zobeir, who was succeeded by Ayesha. When she had uttered what she had to say with her loud shrill voice, the Bassorians were divided, some saying she had spoken truly, the opposite party giving them the lie, till at last they came to throwing the gravel and pebbles in one

another's faces. Ayesha, perceiving this, alighted from her litter; whereupon one of the Arabs made up to her, and said, "O mother of the faithful, the murdering of Othman was a thing of less moment than thy coming out from thy house upon this cursed camel. Thou hadst a veil and a protection from God; but thou hast rent the veil, and set at nought the protection. All this was to reproach Ayesha for her imprudence in engaging in this expedition. At last both sides drew their swords, and fought till night parted them. The next day they fought again; in which skirmish, a great many being wounded on both sides, most were killed on Othman's. When they grew weary of fighting they began to parley; and at last agreed upon this article: That a messenger should be sent to Medina, to inquire whether Telha and Zobeir came into the inauguration of Ali voluntarily or by compulsion. When the messenger arrived at Medina, and delivered his errand, the people were all silent for a while. At last Assamah stood up and said that they were compelled. But his saying so had like to have cost him his life, if a friend of his, a man of authority, had not taken him by the hand and led him home. While these matters were transacting at Medina, Ayesha's party sent to Othman to come out, and deliver up the city to them; but he answered that their demand was not conformable to the agreement, which was to stay for an answer from Medina. Notwithstanding which, Telha and Zobeir, resolved to omit no favourable opportunity, took the advantage of a tempestuous night, and got into the mosque; where, after a skirmish, in which about forty of Othman's men were killed, he himself was seized. Word was immediately sent of his capture to Ayesha, with a request to know in what way it was her pleasure that he should be disposed of. The sentence she at first pronounced was death, but one of her women saying to her, "I adjure thee by God and the companions of the apostle, do not kill him," that penalty was changed into forty stripes and imprisonment.

During the stay of Ali at Arrabdah, he sent Mohammed the son of Abou Beker, and Mohammed the son of Jaafar, to his

friends at Cufah, with a letter, in which he did not so much press them to fight for him, as to come and arbitrate between him, and those that had made a separation from him. He told them, "how much he preferred them to all the rest of the provinces, and what confidence he reposed in them in the time of his extremity. That they should help the religion of God, and repair to him in order to make use of such means as might be proper for the reconciling this divided people, and making them brethren again." In the meantime he did not neglect to send to Medina, from which town he was plentifully supplied with horses, arms, and all necessaries. In his public harangues he represented to the people "the great blessing with which God had indulged them by giving them the religion, whereby those tribes were now *united* who formerly by their quarrels used to reduce one another to a despicable condition. That this peace continued, till this man (meaning Othman) fell into the hands of those whom the devil had set on work to make a disturbance. However it was necessary that this people, like other nations had been before it, should be divided; and we must therefore call on God to avert the present evil." Then turning to his son he said, "Whatsoever is, is of necessity. And the time will come when this people shall be divided into seventy-three sects; the worst of which will be that, which sets me at nought and will not follow my example. You have known this and seen it; wherefore keep close to your religion, and be directed in the right way; for it is the direction of your prophet. Let alone all that is too hard for you, till you can bring it to the test of the Koran. But whatever the Koran plainly approveth that stand to firmly, and what it disapproveth reject. Delight in God for your Lord; and in Islam* for your religion; in Mohammed for your prophet, and in the Koran for your guide and director."

In the meanwhile, Ali was impatiently expecting news from

* That is Mohammedanism. The word signifies delivering one's self up; and, with the article Al, it is restrained to the signification of delivering one's self up to God.

his two messengers that he had sent to Cufah. But Abu Musa who, as we have before observed, had sent him word at first, that all was well on that side the country, and acquainted him with the particulars of all that concerned him there, perceiving how the face of things had suddenly altered, and apprehensive of the success of Ayesha, Telha, and Zobeir at Bassorah, began to waver in his allegiance. So that when Mohammed the son of Abou Beker, and Mohammed the son of Jaafar, came to Cufah with Ali's letter, and stood up among the people according to his command, there was a perfect silence. We may observe here, once for all, that upon such occasions, the way was, for all the people to run to the mosque, where everything was published in the hearing of all present, and every free Mohammedan had the liberty of assenting or dissenting to the matter in deliberation, according as he was influenced by his prejudice or judgment.

Ali's agents returned with a bad answer to his message.

Ali was then advanced as far as Dulkhar, where his governor Othman came to wait upon him. Ali told him, that he had sent him to Bassorah with a beard, but he was come back without one.

As soon as Ali had received Abu Musa's answer, he despatched Alashtar, together with Ebn Abas, to Cufa, with large powers and instructions, to use their own discretion in rectifying whatsoever they should find amiss. When they had delivered their errand, and desired the assistance of the Cufians, Abu Musa made a speech to them, the gist of which was :—

Sheath your swords and take the heads off your lances; cut your bow strings, and receive him that is injured into your houses, till this business is made up, and the disturbance ceased.

Ebn Abbas and Alashtar returning to Ali with this news, he last of all sent his eldest son Hasan, and Ammar along with him. Abu Musa received Hasan with respect; but when they came into the mosque to debate the matter of assisting Ali, he opposed it with the same vigour that he had done before, re-

peating all along the saying of Mohammed's, which he affirmed to have had from his own mouth, "That if there should be a sedition, for him who sat, it should be better than for him who stood," &c. Ammar, upon this, took him up briskly, and told him that the apostle directed that speech to him, who was far better sitting than standing at any time. Still Abu Musa persisted in exerting his utmost to hinder them from complying with Ali's proposals. When the people began to be in a tumult, Zeid, the son of Sauchan, stood up and pulled out a letter from Ayesha, commanding him either to stay at home, or else to come to her assistance, together with another to the Cufians, to the same effect. The debate grew very warm on both sides, till at last Hasan, the son of Ali, rose up and said, "Hearken to the request of your emperor, and help us in this calamity which has fallen on you and us. Thus saith the emperor of the faithful: 'Either I do wrong myself, or else I suffer injury. If I suffer injury, God will help me; if I do wrong, he will take vengeance upon me. By Allah, Telha and Zobeir were the first that inaugurated me, and the first that prevaricated. Have I discovered any covetous inclination, or perverted justice? Wherefore come on, and command that which is good, and forbid that which is evil.'" This moved the audience, and the heads of the tribes spoke one after another, telling the people that it was highly requisite for them to comply with such a reasonable demand, and go to his assistance. Hasan told them that he was going back to his father, and they that thought fit might go along with him, and the rest follow by water. Accordingly, there came over to him nearly nine thousand in all; six thousand two hundred by land, and two thousand four hundred by water.

Upon hearing the news from Cufah, Ayesha and her party began to be in some perplexity at Bassorah. They held frequent consultations, and seemed to be in a hopeless condition. Messages passed backwards and forwards, with a view to compromise the matter; and the negociation went so far that Ali, Telha, and Zobeir had several interviews, walking about together

in the sight of both the armies, so that every one expected that there would have been a peace concluded. Ali's army consisted of thirty thousand men, all experienced soldiers, and if that of his enemies exceeded his in number, yet it was principally composed of raw recruits; besides that, they had not a general to command them who could in any way be a match for Ali.

It is said, that at first Zobeir declined fighting with Ali; but that having acquainted Ayesha with the circumstances, that woman was so envenomed against him, that she would not listen to an accommodation on any terms.

The two armies lay in order of battle on their arms, opposite to one another. During the night the Cufians fell upon the Separatists. When Telha and Zobeir heard of it, they said they knew very well that Ali would never settle the matter without bloodshed; and Ali said the same of them. Thus they were of necessity drawn to a battle, which was fought next day. Ayesha, to give life and courage to her friends, mounted upon her great camel, was carried up and down the field, riding in a litter of the shape of a cage.

In the heat of the battle, when the victory began to incline towards Ali, Merwan said to him, "It is but a little while ago since Telha was amongst the murderers of Othman, and now he is so attached to worldly grandeur, that he appears amongst those who seek to avenge his blood;" and with those words let fly an arrow, and wounded him in the leg. His horse, which was struck at the same time, threw him; he called for help, and said, "O, God, take vengeance upon me for Othman, according to thy will!" Perceiving his boot full of blood, he ordered one of his men to take him up behind him, who conveyed him into a house in Bassorah, where he died. But just before he died he saw one of Ali's men, and asked him if he belonged to the emperor of the faithful. Being informed that he did, "Give me, then," said he, "your hand, that I may put mine in it; and by the action renew the oath of fidelity which I have already made to Ali." The words were no sooner out of his

mouth than he expired. When Ali heard it, he said God would not call him to heaven till he had blotted out his first breach of his word by this last protestation of his fidelity.

Mircond writes, that Zobeir being informed that Ammar Jaasser was in Ali's camp, and knowing that Mohammed had formerly said that he was a person that was always for justice and right, withdrew himself out of the battle, and took the road towards Mecca. Being come as far as a valley which is crossed by a rivulet called Sabaa, he met with Hanaf Ebn Kais, who was there encamped with all his men, awaiting the issue of the battle, in order to join himself to the conqueror.

Hanaf knew who he was at a distance, and said to his men, "Is there nobody can bring me any tidings of Zobeir?" One of them, whose name was Amrou Ebn Jarmuz, went off immediately and came up to him. Zobeir at first bade him keep his distance; but after some discourse, growing into greater confidence of him, he cried out "Salat," that is, "to prayers" (the hour of prayer being then come). "Salat," repeated Amrou; and, as Zobeir was prostrating himself, took his opportunity and struck his head off at one blow with his sabre, and carried it to Ali. When Ali saw the head, he let fall some tears, and said, "Go, wretched villain, and carry this good news to Ebn Safiah in hell." Amrou was so moved with these words, that, laying aside all respect, he said to him, "You are the ill destiny of all the Mussulmans; if one delivers you from any of your enemies, you immediately denounce him to hell. And if a man kills any one of your friends, he becomes instantly a companion of the devil." His passion increasing into rage and despair, he drew his sword and ran himself through.

So long as Ayesha's camel stood upon his legs, the hottest of the battle was about him. Tabari says, that no less than threescore and ten men that held his bridle had their hands cut off. Ayesha's litter was stuck so full of arrows and javelins, that it looked like a porcupine. At last the camel was hamstrung, and Ayesha was forced to lie where it fell till

all was over. Ali, having got an entire victory, came to her and asked her how she did. Some historians say that there was some reproachful language exchanged between them. However, he treated her civilly, and dismissed her handsomely with a very good equipage, and commanded his two sons Hasan and Hosein to wait upon her a day's journey. He confined her to her house at Medina, and forbade her at her peril to intermeddle any more with affairs of state. She went to Mecca, and stayed out the time of the pilgrimage there, after which she returned to Medina. As for the spoils, Ali proposed to divide them among the heirs of his men that were killed, which did not exceed a thousand. Then constituting Abdallah Ebn Abbas his lieutenant over Bassorah, he went to Cufah, where he established the seat of his government or caliphate.

This complete victory rendered Ali exceedingly powerful. He was now master of Irak, Egypt, Arabia, Persia and Khorassan. So that there was none left that could give him the least disturbance, but Moawiyah and the Syrians under his command. Ali seemed not to be apprehensive of any molestation from them after such great success, and sent a messenger to Moawiyah, entreating him to come in. Moawiyah kept putting off the messenger by different excuses, till Amrou the son of Ali, who was then in Palestine could come to him. Amrou, to his great satisfaction, found the Syrians very eager to revenge the blood of Othman, and did what in him lay to urge them on. Upon this, Amrou and Moawiyah resolved to stand out to the last against Ali, Amrou having first stipulated for himself, that in case of success he should have the lieutenancy of Egypt, which he had conquered in the reign of Omar. This was readily promised him, and Amrou, in the presence of all the army, took the oath of allegiance to Moawiyah, acknowledging him to be lawful caliph and prince of the Mussulmans. This action which had been concerted between them two, was followed by the acclamations of the people, who unanimously took the same oath.

As soon as Ali was apprised of these commotions in Syria,

he marched towards that country with an army of ninety thousand men.

Ali continued his march towards Seffein, a place between Irak and Syria, where the enemy's army was posted, consisting of fourscore thousand men. At last, both the armies advancing, they came in sight of one another, in the last month of the thirty-sixth year of the flight of Mohammed.

The first month of the next year was spent without doing anything but sending messengers backwards and forwards, in order to effect an accommodation between them, but all to no purpose. On the commencement of the next month, however, they began to fight in small parties, without risking a general engagement. It is reported, that in the space of one hundred and ten days, there were no less than ninety skirmishes between them; that the number of the slain on Moawiyah's side, was five and forty thousand, and that on Ali's, five and twenty thousand, six and twenty of whom had been present at the battle of Beder, and were honoured with the title of Sahabah, that is, "the companions of the prophet." Ali had commanded his men never to begin the battle first, but stay till the enemy gave the onset, nor to kill any man that should turn his back, nor to take any of their plunder, or ill-use the women. Nor were Moawiyah and Amrou wanting on their side in expressing their concern for the effusion of the blood of the Mussulmans; especially when Ammar Ebn Jasar, Eli's general of the horse was killed. He was about ninety years of age, and had been in three several engagements with Mohammed himself. He lived reverenced, and died lamented by all. "Do you see," said Moawiyah, "at what a rate the people expose their lives, upon our account?" "See!" says Amrou, "would to God that I had died twenty years ago." Upon the death of Ammar, Ali took twelve thousand chosen men, and made so fierce an onslaught upon Moawiyah's army, that all the ranks of it were broken.

The last battle they fought at Seffein continued all night, to the great disadvantage of the Syrians. Alashtar pushed them

back to their camp, and Ali supported him. The victory had been complete but for the following stratagem of Amrou's. Sending for Moawiyah in great haste, he advised him to order his men to hoist up the Korans upon the points of their lances, and to cry out; "This is the book that ought to decide all our differences; this is the book of God between us and you." This stratagem did not fail of the desired success; for as soon as the Irakians, who formed the chief strength of Ali's army saw this, they threw down their arms, and said to Ali, "Will you not answer the book of God?" To which Ali replied, "As you are men of truth and honour, go on and fight your enemy, for Amrou and Moawiyah have no relation to religion nor the Koran." The Irakians threatened not only to desert him, but to deliver him into the hands of his enemies, if he did not sound a retreat: and some of the sectaries (an enthusiastic people, that refuse obedience to their superiors, both in things sacred and civil), declared to him that they would serve him as the son of Affan had been served, that is as Othman, who had been murdered. Ali therefore was forced to call off Alashtar, who fell back with great reluctance and only after repeated orders to retreat, grieved at the heart, to see a glorious victory snatched out of his hands by such a stratagem.

As soon as the battle was over, a messenger being sent to Moawiyah, to demand the meaning of that action, he answered, "That it was the wish of his party that the difference should be left to the arbitration of two persons, who might determine it according to the true sense of the Koran, and the tradition of the people." Whereupon Ashaath, one of those who had the greatest credit and influence among the soldiers of Irak, and whose fidelity it was suspected had been tampered with by Moawiyah, asked Ali how he approved of this expedient. Ali answered him coldly, saying, "He that is not at liberty cannot give his advice. It belongs to you to manage this affair according as you shall think fit among yourselves." The army, however, determined to follow it. Now the person that they nominated in Ali's behalf was Abu Musa Al Ashari, a good

honest well-meaning man, but exceedingly simple. Ali did not approve of the choice, because Musa had formerly been drawn aside, and had forsaken his interest. He had rather have had Ben Abbas; but was answered, that he was his own cousin-german, and they would have none but such as should deal impartially between him and Moawiyah. He next proposed Alashtar, but they were resolved he should accept of Abu Musa. Moawiyah, on his part, nominated Amrou the son of Aas, deservedly reputed the quickest-witted man of the age. These two referees took a security signed by Ali and Moawiyah, and both the armies, in behalf of themselves and their families, by which they bound themselves to ratify and confirm the sentence of the referees, which was to be determined by the next Ramadan. This arrangement being made, Ali retired to Cufah, and Moawiyah to Damascus, leaving the command of their respective armies to one of their generals, and the authority of things relating to religion in the hands of a particular Imam. But as soon as Ali came to Cufah, twelve thousand of those that could read the Koran reproached him with his base submission to this accommodation, as having out of fear of temporal calamity submitted to the determination of men, when the Koran expressly says, that "Judgment belongeth to God alone."

Eight months after the battle of Seffein, the two arbitrators met in a place situated between Mecca, Cufah, and Syria. There came along with them several of the Sahabah, or companions of the prophet. At this conference Ebn Abbas bade Abu Musa remember this, whatsoever else he forgot, that Ali had no blemish to render him incapable of the government, nor Moawiyah any virtue to qualify him for it. Amrou, who knew very well the genius of his partner, treated him with the utmost civility and respect, till he gained a complete influence over him, and at last made him believe that it was quite impracticable to attempt to accommodate matters, without deposing both the present competitors, and leaving the choice of a third to the people. This important article once fixed, a tribunal was erected between both the armies, from which each

of the umpires was publicly to declare his opinion. Abu Musa wished Amrou to go up first, but he alleged so many reasons why he ought to yield to Ali's arbitrators the preference, that he easily overcame all his scruples.

Accordingly Abu Musa ascending the tribunal, pronounced these words with a loud voice: "I depose Ali and Moawiyah from the caliphate (or government) to which they pretend, after the same manner as I take this ring from my finger." Having made this declaration, he immediately came down. Then Amrou went up and said, "You have heard how Abu Musa has for his part deposed Ali; as for my part I depose him too, and I give the caliphate to Moawiyah, and invest him with it after the same manner as I put this ring upon my finger; and this I do with so much the more justice, because he is Othman's heir and avenger, and the worthiest of all men to succeed him."

After the publication of these sentences, Ali's party, confounded at the unexpected issue of the arbitration, began to complain grievously of Abu Musa. He for his own part accused Amrou of not having performed the agreement between them. From complaints they came to ill language; and, in short, Abu Musa, fully ashamed of being outwitted by Amrou, and not only having good reason to fear Ali's displeasure, but also, thinking himself hardly safe in the army, took to flight, and retired to Mecca.

The Syrians went back to Moawiyah, and wished him joy: and from this time his interests prospered daily, whilst Ali's began to decline. The two opposite parties not only cursed one another, but carried the matter so far as to pronouuce a solemn excommunication, which was always repeated when they made any harangue to the people in the mosque, and this custom continued a long time between the house of Ali and that of Ommiyah, to which Othman and Moawiyah belonged.

In the year, A.D. 657, the Karegites, or Separatists, made an insurrection against Ali. The occasion of their revolt was as follows: Ali having, as already related, put his affairs into the

hands of two arbitrators, some of the Irakians told him that he had done exceedingly wrong, in referring to the judgment of men, what ought to be determined by God alone. Therefore they said, that instead of standing to the peace that he had made, he ought to pursue his enemies, who also were the enemies of God, without quarter. Ali answered, that having once passed his word, he was bound to keep it.

The rebels, not at all satisfied with these reasons, chose for their captain Abdallah, the son of Waheb, who appointed Naharwan (a town between Bagdad and Waset, four miles east of the river Tigris) for the place of rendezvous. To this place every one who was discontented with his government repaired. Of the malcontents, a great number came from Cufah, Bassorah, and Arabia.

Ali took little notice of them at first, his thoughts being more taken up with Moawiyah, whom he looked upon as a much more formidable enemy; but being informed that they were increased to the number of five and twenty thousand men, that they condemned all persons as impious that did not fall in with their sentiments, and that they had already put to death several Mussulmans for refusing to comply with their measures; he resolved, in fine, to exterminate a sect which tended to the subversion of the very foundations of Mohammedanism. Nevertheless he determined to try peaceful measures once more before he had recourse to force of arms. Accordingly, planting a standard without the camp, he made proclamation with sound of trumpet, that whosoever would come under it should have good quarter, and that all who should retire to Cufah, should there also find a sanctuary.

This device succeeded well, for in a very little time the army of the Karegites dispersed itself of its own accord, and Abdallah, the son of Waheb, found himself reduced to four thousand men. However, even with this small number, the arch-rebel was resolved to signalise his bravery by a desperate attempt. Notwithstanding the inequality of his force, he boldly attacked Ali's army. But his rashness was duly

punished; he and all his men were cut to pieces, nine only excepted, which was also the total number of the slain on Ali's side.

This victory, which was gained in the thirty-eighth year of the Hejirah, having re-united all the Arabians under the government of Ali, the Syrians alone remained to be reduced. Ali was for marching against Moawiyah immediately after the victory, but some of his great men opposed him.

Ali, at the beginning of his caliphate, had conferred the government of Egypt upon Saïd, who acquitted himself of his charge with great prudence; for there being in Egypt a numerous faction of Othman's partisans, he knew how to accommodate himself to the time, and managed them with much address. This conduct of Saïd furnished Moawiyah with an occasion of publishing it everywhere that this governor was his friend, and acted in concert with him. These reports he spread abroad on purpose to raise a suspicion of him in Ali's mind, who nevertheless had no better friend belonging to him. To promote this design, Moawiyah forged a letter in Saïd's name, directed to himself, wherein he was made to confess that the reason why he had not attacked the party of the Othmanians, was because he was entirely in Moawiyah's interest. This device had its desired effect, for as soon as the news reached Ali's ears he recalled Saïd from his government, and sent in his room Mohammed, the son of Abou Beker, the first caliph, which was the cause of new troubles in that country.

His arrival, therefore, was quickly followed by dissensions and civil wars, and these disorders grew to such a height, that Ali was obliged to send Malec Alashtar, to restore his authority there. But Moawiyah, who had notice of the sending of this new governor, instigated a countryman who lived upon the confines of Arabia and Egypt, and at whose house Malec Alashtar was to lodge on his way to Egypt, to give him poison in the entertainment which he had prepared for him.

This man, an old friend of Moawiyah's, punctually executed his orders, and gave Malec some poisoned honey at supper, of

the effects of which he died before he stirred out of the house. Then he despatched Amrou Ebn Aas, with six thousand horse, to take possession of the government of Egypt in his name, who made such speed that in a few days he came up to the capital city, where he was joined by Ebn Sharig, the chief of Othman's party. With this combined force the two marched together to engage Mohammed, the son of Abou Beker, who as yet retained the name and authority of governor for Ali. Mohammed was routed, and fell into his enemies' hands alive, who quickly killed him, and enclosing his dead body in the skin of an ass, burnt him to ashes. As soon as Ayesha heard of the death of her brother, Mohammed, she took it extremely to heart, and kneeled down at the end of all her prayers, to beg a curse upon Moawiyah and Amrou.

All this year there was a continued succession of incursions made into Ali's territories, who was all this while daily employed in making speeches, and moving his army to go against Moawiyah, but all his eloquence made no impression upon them.

Ali promptly sent assistance to his lieutenant at Bassorah, under the command of Hareth, which arrived so seasonably, that Moawiyah's general was beaten and killed in the battle, which was fought near Bassorah. Upon this the city surrendered to the government of Ali, who immediately sent back Abdallah Ebn Abbas to take the command of it, as he had done before. This was in the thirty-eighth year of the Hejirah.

The next year passed over without any considerable adventures, for the Syrians, weary of the war, attempted nothing against the Arabians, and the Arabians had enough to do to preserve themselves.

The truce, however, was but of short duration, for in the beginning of the fortieth year of the Hejirah, Moawiyah began to exert himself in earnest, and sent Ebn Arthah with three thousand horse towards that province of Arabia called Hejaz, to seize its two principal towns, Mecca and Medina, with which he had secretly kept up a correspondence ever since Othman's death, and by

this means to open himself a way into Yemen, or "Arabia the Happy." Upon his approach, Ali's two governors abandoned their respective charges, for want of forces sufficient to make a defence, and Ebn Arthah made the inhabitants take the oath of allegiance to Moawiyah. After shedding some blood at Medina, which gave the people an aversion to Moawiyah's government, he proceeded in his march to Arabia Felix, where he put some thousands to the sword.

All this while Moawiyah was in Syria, at Damascus, and Ali at Cufah. Ali always prayed publicly for Moawiyah, Amrou, and Dehoc; Moawiyah, on the other side, prayed for Ali, Hasan, and Hosein.

However, Ali did not omit the sending Jariyah to pursue Ebn Arthah with four thousand horse; but he had scarce set out towards Yemen, when the other was returning into Syria. About the same time another great calamity befel Ali. His brother Okail went over to Moawiyah, who received him with open arms, and assigned him large revenues.

A little while after the battle of Naharwan, three of those among the Karegites that were the most zealous for the advancement of their sect, met together at Mecca, and making frequent mention among themselves, of those that were killed in the battle, magnified their merit, and bewailed their loss. These three men, Abdarrhaman, Barak, whom some surname Turk, and Amrou, said, one to the other, "If Ali, Moawiyah, and Amrou, the son of Aas, these false Imams, were dead, the affairs of the Mussulmans would be in good condition." Immediately the first of them said to his companions, "For my part, if you will, I will give you a good account of Ali." The second, hearing this discourse, said he would undertake to make a good riddance of Moawiyah; and the third promised to kill Amrou Ebn Aas. These three men being thus unanimously resolved to execute their murderous design, pitched upon a Friday, which fell upon the seventeenth of the month Ramadan. After having poisoned their swords, every man took his road; the

first that to Cufah, the second that to Damascus, and the third that to Egypt.

Barak, one of the three devotees, being arrived at Damascus, struck Moawiyah in the reins, but the wound was not mortal.

The assassin, who was instantly seized, discovered the conspiracy which he had made with his two comrades, and was condemned to have his hands and feet cut off, and be suffered to live. He did survive for some days the execution of this sentence; but one of Moawiyah's friends killed him with his own hands.

Amrou Ebn Beker, the second of the conspirators went to Egypt to strike his blow; Amrou was then, fortunately for him, ill, which hindered him that day from performing the office of Imam in the mosque; wherefore he appointed another to supply his place, who fell down dead with the blow which the assassin, who mistook him for Amrou, gave him.

The third of these conspirators, Abdarrhaman, in the execution of his wicked design against Ali, had better success than his other two companions had against their intended victims. On his arrival at Cufah, he took up his lodgings at a woman's house, whose nearest relations had been killed at the battle of Naharwan, and who for that reason cherished in heart a strong desire of being revenged upon Ali. She joined with him two other men whose names were Durwan and Sheith to assist him.

Friday, the seventeenth of this month being come, Ali went out of his house early in the morning to go to the mosque, and it was observed that the household birds made a great noise as he passed through his yard; and that one of his slaves having thrown his cudgel at them to make them quiet, he said to him, "Let them alone, for their cries are only lamentations foreboding my death."

As soon as he came into the mosque, those three villains, who waited for him, pretended to quarrel among themselves, and drew their swords.

Derwan made a blow at Ali, but missed him, and the blow fell upon the gate of the mosque. Abdarrhaman struck him upon the head, just in the same place where he had received a wound in the battle of Ahzab, which was fought in Mohammed's time, and that stroke was mortal. The three assassins had time to make their escape without being apprehended. Derwan crept home, where a man who had seen him with his sword in hand against Ali, went and killed him. Shabib took to his heels, and ran so well, that he was never caught. Abdarrhaman concealed himself for some time. When Ali was asked who was the author of such an enormous attempt against his life, he answered, "You shall soon hear tidings of him." In short a Mussulman having found Abdarrhaman hid in a corner, with his sword in his hand, asked him if it was not he that had wounded Ali; the assassin, willing to deny it, was constrained by his own conscience to confess it; and was instantly brought before Ali. Ali delivered him in custody to his eldest son Hasan, with orders to let him want nothing; and if Ali died of his wound, then to execute his murderer at one stroke only. Hasan punctually obeyed the command of his father who died on the 19th, 20th, or 21st of the same month, that is, the third, fourth or fifth day after he was wounded.

As to Ali's age, authors differ. Some say he was sixty-three, others sixty-six, and some fifty-nine. The time of his caliphate was five years all but three months. Neither are writers better agreed as to the place of his burial; according to some he was buried opposite the mosque in Cufah, or according to others in the royal palace; while a third class asserted that his son Hasan conveyed him to Medina, and laid him by the side of his wife Fatima. The most probable opinion is, that he was buried in that place (near Cufah), which, to this day, is visited by the Mussulman's as his tomb: at which a great many oblations are usually left by the devotees.

As to his person, he had a very red face, large eyes, a prominent stomach, a bald head, a large beard; he was of a vigorous frame of body, rather short than middle-sized; of a good

look, florid and youthful, and frequently smiling. He had in all nine wives, the first of whom was Fatima, Mohammed's daughter, during whose life he married no other. By her he had three children, Hasan, Hosein, and Mohassan, of whom the last died in infancy.

The second wife was Omm-al Nebiyin, by whom he had four children, Abdallah, Abbas, Othman, and Jasaar, who were all four killed at the battle of Kerbelah.

Though there are but fourteen sons mentioned it is certain he had fifteen, whereof five only left any posterity behind them: namely, Hasan, Hosein, Mohammed Ebn Hanifiyah, Abbas, and Amrou. As for the number of his daughters they are usually reckoned at eighteen.

Among the many surnames, or honourable titles, which the Mussulmans bestowed upon Ali, there are two principal ones; the first of which is Wasi, which signifies in Arabic, legatee, mandatary, executor of a man's will, and heir, that is, of Mohammed. His second title is Mortada, or Mortadi, which signifies "beloved by, or acceptable to, God." They called him, even whilst he was alive, Esed Allah, algalib, "the victorious lion of God;" to which may be added, Haidar, which also in the Arabic language, signifies "a lion." The Shii, who are his followers, or rather adorers, frequently call him Faid alanwar, "the distributer of lights or graces." And in Persian, Shah Mordman, "the king of men," and Shir Khoda, "the lion of God."

The greatest part of the Mussulmans pretend that Ali was the first that embraced their religion.

However, these great eulogies did not hinder his name, and that of all his family, from being cursed, and their persons excommunicated through all the mosques of the empire of the caliphs of the house of Ommyah, from Moawiyah, down to the time of Omar Ebn Abdalaziz, who suppressed this solemn malediction. There were besides several caliphs of the house of Abbas, who expressed a great aversion to Ali and all his posterity; such as Motaded and Motawakkel, to whom he is

reported to have appeared in their sleep and threatened with his indignation. On the other hand, the Fatimite caliphs of Egypt caused his name to be added to that of Mohammed in the publication of the times of prayer, which is made from the terrace of the mosques.

It is said that the sepulchre of Ali was kept hid during the reign of the family of Ommiyah, and not discovered till the accession of the Abbasides, which is not credible. In the year 367 of the Hejirah (A.D. 977), Abhaudedaulat built a sumptuous monument over it, which the Persians generally call Konbud Faid alanwar, "the dome of the dispenser of the lights and graces." Now, notwithstanding the sepulchre of Ali, near the city of Cufah, is very well known, there are some of his sect who believe him to be still alive, and affirm, that he will come again at the end of the world, and fill the earth with justice. Some among them are so extravagant as to make him a divine person. The more moderate say that he is not truly God, but that in a great many things he partakes of the divine nature.

Among all the Mohammedans alike, Ali has a great reputation for wisdom. There is extant of his a "Centiloquium," or "a hundred sentences," which have been translated out of Arabic into Turkish and Persian. There is likewise a collection of verses by him under the title of "Anwar Alokail." And in the Bodleian library there is a large book of his sentences, a specimen whereof has been annexed to Ockley's history. But his most celebrated piece is that entitled "Jefr we Jame." It is written on parchment in a mystic character, intermixed with figures, which narrate or typify all the grand events that are to happen from the foundation of Mussulmanism to the end of the world. This parchment, which was deposited in the hands of his family, has never been deciphered. Jaafer Sadek has, indeed succeeded in partially interpreting it; but the entire explication of it is reserved for the twelfth Imam, who is surnamed by way of excellence, the Mohdi, or "Grand Director."

Besides these books to which we have referred, we find

in different authors several sentences and apophthegms, under the name of Ali. The following, which is one of the most instructive, is quoted by the author of "Rabi Alakyar," "He that would be rich without means, powerful without subjects, and subject without a master, hath nothing to do but to leave off sinning and serve God, and he will find these three things." One of his captains having asked him one day, with impudence enough, what was the reason that the reigns of Abou Beker and Omar, his predecessors, were so peaceable, and that of Othman and his own were so full of troubles and divisions, Ali answered him very coolly, "The reason is plain, it is because Othman and I served Abou Beker and Omar during their reigns; and Othman and I found nobody to serve us but you, and such as are like you."

Somebody having told Ali one day that Moawiyah had said that he and those of his house distinguished themselves by their bravery, Zobeir and his family acquired distinction by their magnificence, but that for his own part, and his family's, they did not pretend to distinguish themselves from others, or to excel by anything but their humanity and clemency. Ali answered those that told him so, that it looked as if Moawiyah had made use of artifice in his discourse, having a mind, if possible, to spur on Zobeir and himself to make a display of their magnificence and bravery; to the end that the one, throwing himself into a vast expense, and the other into great hazards, they might not be in a condition to oppose his usurpation; while he himself sought to gain the affections of the people, by boasting of the sweetness of his temper.

There is, moreover, in the book entitled "Rabi Alakyar," another maxim of Ali, which is memorable, and very contrary to the conduct of those who vaunt of themselves on account of being of his sect. "Take great care," said he, "never to separate yourselves from the fellowship of the other Mussulmans; for he that separates himself from them belongs to the devil, as the sheep that leave the flock belong to the wolf. Therefore give no quarter to him who marches under the

standard of schism, though he has my turban upon his head, for he carries along with him the infallible mark of a man that is out of the way."

Ali's sectaries are called by the Mussulmans (who entitle themselves Sonnites, that is, observers of the tradition, or orthodox) by the scandalous name of Schiites, which is formed from the term Schiyah, and signifies properly a scandalous reprobate sect. A sect that follows approved opinions, is called by the Arabs, Medheb. But these sectaries of Ali, of whom we are speaking, do not call themselves by that opprobrious designation. On the contrary, they apply it to their adversaries, calling their own sect Adaliyah, which means the religion of them that follow justice and the right side.

The partisans of Ali have, in greater or less numbers, been dispersed throughout all the countries of the empire of the Mussulmans, and have, from time to time, raised considerable disturbances. They have possessed several kingdoms both in Asia and Africa. At this day all the great Empire of the Persians, and one half of the princes of the Uzbecks, whose dominions lie beyond the river Gihon, and some Mohammedan kings of the Indies, make profession of this sect.*

These are the principal memoirs relating to that great caliph, who, laying aside those absurd fabulous stories which they tell of him, was, if he be considered with regard to his courage, temper, piety, and understanding, one of the greatest men of his nation. The inscription of his seal was "The kingdom belongs to the only mighty God."

'Ali's literary accomplishments are highly extolled by Ockley, but the specimen he has given of them—a selection of the sentences "that are said to have been written by him (but which were rather collected by him) is not to be compared to a poem of Ali's, which I had translated for me by an eminent Professor of Oriental literature, and published many years ago

* *Sonnites* and *Schiites* are the two leading sects into which the Mohammedan world is divided; and they have gone on cursing and persecuting each other, without any intermission for about twelve hundred years. The *Sonni* is the established sect in Turkey, and the *Schiites* in Persia.

in my "Travels in the East." The following sentences form less than one half of those given by Ockley, in his "History of the Saracens":—

SENTENCES OF ALI,

SON-IN-LAW OF MOHAMMED, AND HIS FOURTH SUCCESSOR.

PREFATORY NOTICE BY OCKLEY.

If providence (says Ockley), hath removed us to a greater distance from the influence of those genial rays which ripen the wits of the eastern nations, it hath made us abundant amends, by indulging us in this conceit, that we are wiser than all the rest of the world besides.

There are some sorts of pleasing madness of which it would be cruelty to cure a man. By bringing him to his senses you make him miserable.

You will ask me, perhaps, what is the meaning of all this? Why, in good truth, the meaning of it is, a just indignation against the impertinence of those who imagine that they know everything, when in reality they understand nothing.

And, to be more particular, the folly of the westerns, in despising the wisdom of the eastern nations, and looking upon them as brutes and barbarians; whilst we arrogate to ourselves everything that is wise and polite; and if we chance to light upon a just thought, we applaud ourselves upon the discovery, though it was better understood three thousand years ago.

This happens to us through want of good reading, and a true way of thinking; for the case is this, that little smattering of knowledge which we have is entirely derived from the east. They first communicated it to the Greeks (a vain, conceited people, who never penetrated into the depths of Oriental wisdom); from whom the Romans had theirs. And after barbarity had spread itself over the western world, the Arabians, by their conquests, restored it again to Europe. And it is the wildest conceit that can be imagined, for us to suppose that we have greater geniuses, or greater application, than is to be found in

those countries. If it be allowed that we have of late made greater advances in the sciences, that is not so much to our present purpose, as the consideration of things of universal necessity, the fear of God, the regulation of our appetites, prudent economy, decency and sobriety of behaviour in all conditions and emergencies of life; in any of which articles (which, after all, are the grand concern), if the westerns have made any, even the least improvement, upon the eastern wisdom, I must confess myself to be very much mistaken.

They have their wisdom by inheritance, derived from their forefathers through numerous generations. They are tenacious of their ancient customs, and retain the precepts of their ancestors; they couch more solid wisdom under one single aphorism, than some European writers would put into a system.

Some persons of understanding have been of opinion, that the wisdom of a nation may be judged of by the sententiousness of their proverbs and sayings in common use among them: in this the Arabs excel all nations.

They are called the Sentences of Ali, the son of Abu Taleb. The whole book is, as near as I can guess, not much less in bulk than our New Testament.

But I am far from believing that Ali was the author of all these sentences. He might collect them, for aught I know, and add some more of his own; but this I am sure of, that they savour of much greater antiquity than the time in which he lived. He was contemporary with Mohammed, who flourished in the year of our Lord 622.

The book is a venerable piece of antiquity, and it is pity but we had it all translated; which would be difficult to be exactly performed, unless by a person who has had the advantage of travelling into the eastern countries.

The sentences are full, and to the purpose. They breathe a spirit of devotion, strictness of life, and express the greatest gravity, and a most profound experience in all the affairs of human life.

All that I say is, that there is enough, even in this little handful, to vindicate the Arabians from the imputation of that gross ignorance fastened upon them by modern novices.

SENTENCES OF ALI.

"1. Fear God, and you will have no cause to fear any one else.

"2. Resist thyself, and thou shalt have peace.

"3. The best riches are those employed in the service of God.

"4. One offence counts for much, a thousand services for little.

"5. The remembrance of youth is a sigh.

"6. Honour thy father, and thy son will honour thee.

"7. The enjoyment and delight of life consisteth in security.

"8. Thy destiny is seeking after thee; therefore refrain from seeking after it.

"9. The restraining of desires and appetites is the greatest holy war.

"10. Thy delight in thyself arises from the corruption of thy understanding.

"11. He delights in contempt who confideth his grievance to another.

"12. The showing mercy to the afflicted bringeth down mercy.

"13. He delights in disappointment who depends upon bad men for support.

"14. I delight more in the resolution of a religious man than in the strength of a strong man.

"15. A man's advice is according to the measure of his experience.

"16. A man's messenger is the interpreter of his meaning; but his letter is of more efficacy than his discourse.

"17. Consider before thou doest any thing, and thou shalt not be blamed in what thou doest.

"18. The glittering ornaments of the world spoil weak understandings.

"19. The power of religion enforces abstinence.

"20. For the soul to be employed about what shall not accompany it after death, is the greatest weakness.

"21. To depend upon every one without distinction, is weakness of understanding.

"22. He is a man of understanding, who overcometh his appetite, and will not sell his world to come, for his present world.

"23. He is the cunning man that looks more narrowly after himself than other people.

"24. It is fear which holds the soul from sin, and restrains it from transgression.

"25. He is a prudent man who restrains his tongue from detraction.

"26. He is a believer who purifieth his heart from doubt.

"27. The world is the shadow of a cloud, and the dream of sleep.

"28. The believer always remembers God, and is full of thought: he is thankful in prosperity, and patient in adversity.

"29. There are two sorts of patience: the one, by which we bear up in adversity, which is fine and beautiful: but the other that by which we withstand the commission of evil, is better.

"30. A man's admiring himself is a demonstration of his deficiency, and a branch of the weakness of his understanding.

"31. He that firmly believeth in a future state, is, upon his own account, the most serious thinking man of all men in the world.

"32. He is a wise man who can govern himself both in his anger, desire, and fear.

"33. Opportunity is swift of flight, slow of return.

"34. To make one good action constantly succeed another is the perfection of goodness.

"35. Patience in poverty, with a good reputation, is better than a plentiful maintenance with contempt.

"36. A wise enemy is better than a foolish friend.

"37. A man's affliction is the forerunner of his prosperity.

"38. Men are more like the time they live in, than like their fathers.

"39. The value of every man is the good which he doth.

"40. He that knows himself, knows his God.

"41. There is no rest where there is envy.

"42. It concerns thee more to flee from thyself, than from a lion.

"43. He that hath no courage, hath no religion.

"44. A wise man is never poor.

"45. A man governeth his people by doing them good.

"46. He that pursueth that which is not suitable for him, loseth that which is suitable for him.

"47. A man who is given to jesting will never fail of hatred nor contempt.

"48. Despair is a freeman, hope is a slave.

"49. The pursuit of good education is better than the pursuit of riches.

"50. It is better that kings should be unjust, than base.

"51. A man's glory from his virtue is greater than the glory of his pedigree.

"52. Victory over an enemy is forbearance.

"53. The strength of the heart is from the soundness of the faith.

"54. The word of God is the medicine of the heart.

"55. There is a cure for all enmity but the enmity of the envious man.

"56. He that holdeth his peace doth not repent.

"57. A learned conversation is the garden of paradise.

"58. The forgetfulness of death is the rust of the heart.

"59. The greyness of thy head is the annunciation of the approach of death.

"60. Trust in God is the true believer's castle.

"61. Mankind is divided into two parts or sorts: the one

seeketh, and doth not find; another findeth, and is not contented.

"62. The good man liveth, though he be translated to the mansions of the dead.

"63. Knowledge is the ornament of the rich, and the riches of the poor.

"64. Clemency in power, is a defence against the vengeance of God.

"65. The reverence of God blotteth out a great many sins.

"66. Resignation to the providence of God makes the greatest afflictions easy.

"67. A lie is perverting language from the end for which God ordained it.

"68. Adversity makes no impression on a brave soul.

"69. Perfection consists in three things; patience in affliction; moderation in our pursuits; and assisting him that needeth help.

"70. A wise man knoweth a fool, because he hath formerly been ignorant himself; but a fool doth not know a wise man, because he never was wise himself.

"71. Religion is a tree, the root of which is faith; the branch, the fear of God; the flower, modesty; and the fruit, generosity of spirit.

"72. Anger is a fire kindled: he that restraineth it, putteth it out; but he that letteth it loose, is the first that is consumed by it.

"73. Folly is an incurable disease.

"74. Riches, without God, are the greatest poverty and misery.

"75. The most odious of men to the most high God, is he whose thoughts are fixed upon his feeding and his lust.

"76. The most happy man, as to this life, is he to whom God hath given wherewithal to be content, and a good wife.

"77. Justice is the balance of God, which he hath set for men; wherefore do not contradict him in his balance, nor oppose him in his dominion."

Hassan, the son of Ali, Fifth Caliph after Mohammed, A.D. 660—661.

Ali, on his death-bed, followed that singular custom of the prophet and his successors, of abstaining from nominating a successor, or expressing any wish for the appointment of one from among his friends, councillors, or followers. Ali gave a reason for following the example of the prophet, and succeeding caliphs, "That if it pleased God to favour the people (of Islam), he would undoubtedly unite their judgments, and enable them to make a good choice."

"There is nothing (says Ockley) concerning the succession to the administration of affairs in the Koran, and with regard to claims to property in land and sovereignty, thus much only:—'The rule is of God, he giveth it to, and taketh it from whomsoever he will. The earth is God's, he devises it to whomsoever he will.' By these general formulæ of the celestial decrees, a fair field was opened to despots and usurpers: Mohammed's idea was that sovereignty was the right of the strongest, and he once expressly declared that Omar, who was distinguished by the great energy of his character, possessed the qualities of a prophet and caliph. Tradition, has, however, handed down to us, no similar expression in favour of the amiable Ali, his son-in-law. Moreover, it had not escaped him that in the constant progress of history there is nothing immutable; that no human institution can be endued with perpetual duration; and that the spirit of one generation seldom survives that which succeeds it. It was in this sense that he said prophetically, 'the Caliphate will last only thirty years after my death.'

"It is probable, that had Mohammed destined the succession (or, as the Arabs call it, the Caliphate) for his nearest relations, he would have expressly named his son-in-law, Ali, as caliph. As, however, he enjoined nothing on this point, during his life, —for some eulogiums passed on Ali, adduced by the latter's party, are vague and doubtful,—he seems to have committed the appointment of the most worthy to the selection of the

Moslimin. The first whom they elected emir and imam, was the first convert to Islamism, Abu Bekr Essidik (the True), and after his short reign, Omar Alfaruk (the Decisive), to whom they did homage with oath and striking of hands. Omar's severity, equally inflexible to himself and others, and the remarkable force of his character, first impressed on Islamism and the caliphate, the stamp of fanaticism and despotism, which has characterized that institution. The spirit of conquest, indeed, was already manifested by Mohammed's first enterprises against the Christians in Syria, against the Jews in Chaibar, and the idolators of Mecca. Abu Bekr followed his footsteps with his victories in Yemen and Syria; but Omar first erected the triumphal arch of Islamism and the caliphate, by the capture of Damascus and Jerusalem. by the overthrow of the ancient Persian throne, and the sapping of that of Byzantium from which he tore two of its strongest foundation stones, Syria and Egypt."

Ali was no sooner dead than his eldest son, Hassan, performed a pious office; he stood up in the midst of the people, and pronounced a eulogy on his father's character. He said, with solemn energy:—

"You have killed a man (meaning his father) on that same night in which the Koran came down from heaven; on which Issa (Jesus), upon whom be peace, was lifted up to heaven; and on which Joshua, the son of Nun was killed. I swear, by God, none of his predecessors exceeded him, nor will any of his successors be ever equal to him."

After this eulogy the chiefs proceeded to Hassan's inauguration, which was commenced by an address made to him by Kais, in these words: "Stretch out your hand as a token that you will stand by the book of God, and the traditions of the apostle, and make war against all opposers."

Hassan answered: "As to the Book of God, and the traditions of the apostle, they will stand."

Then the chiefs and principal men of Islam came in, and they gave in their adhesion to Ali, declaring, "They would be

subject and obedient to him; they would be at peace with his friends, and at war with his enemies. But some of the chiefs of Irak quite weary of the Syrian war, hesitated and said:

"This man will never serve us for a master; we are for no more fighting."

Notwithstanding the insubordination of the greater party of Ali's men, forty (and some say sixty) thousand had, it is said, before he was murdered, bound themselves to stand by him to death, when he was making preparation to march against his rival at the head of them. With this trusty body of his father's troops, Hassan was persuaded, contrary to his own inclination, to insist upon his right, and renew the dispute with Moawiyah, who held possession of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, and was proclaimed caliph in those countries, even before Ali was killed, and refused to acknowledge Hassan's title, because he accused him of having been an accomplice in the murder of Othman.

Hassan was totally unqualified for such an undertaking, being naturally of a peaceable disposition, and looking upon the effusion of Mussulman's blood with the greatest horror imaginable. Over-persuaded, however, by others, he set forwards on his march, having sent Kais before him with twelve thousand men. Moawiyah was already on his route to meet them, and after a skirmish between Kaias and the Syrians, he halted and determined to await Hassan's arrival. When Hassan came to Madayan, a disturbance broke out in his camp, occasioned by the sudden murder of one of his men, which was no sooner known, than the whole host was in such an uproar, that no regard was paid to his dignity or presence, but in the tumult he was not only jostled from his seat, but received a wound. Upon this he retired into Madayan castle, where the governor's nephew proposed to his uncle to put him in irons, and make a present of him to Moawiyah: his uncle gave him a hearty curse, and said, "What! would you betray the son of the daughter of the apostle of God?" Hassan perceiving the people divided, and himself ill-used and almost deserted by the Irakians, weary of the fatigue and disorders of the government,

wrote to Moawiyah, proffering to resign the caliphate to him upon certain terms.

Hosein his younger brother was utterly against Hassan's abdication, as being a reflection upon, and disparagement to the memory of their father Ali; but Hassan, well apprized of Moawiyah's resolution on the one side, and the fickleness of his own Irakians on the other, persisted in his determination. It is said that before the last battle he wrote to Moawiyah, proposing certain conditions; which Moawiyah refused, and told him, that it was reasonable he should be contented with those that he had expressed in his letter, since it was his own proposition. The articles that Hassan then stipulated for were these. First, that Moawiyah should give him all the money in the treasury of Cufah. Secondly, the revenues of a vast estate in Persia. Thirdly, that Moawiyah should make no reproachful reflections upon his father Ali. Moawiyah would not consent to the last article. Then Hassan requested that he would at least forbear doing it in his hearing; which Moawiyah promised him, but did not keep to his engagement.

The conditions agreed upon, Hassan and Moawiyah went into Cufah together, when Amrou Ebn Al Aas gave Moawiyah a hint, that he thought it proper for him to order Hassan to stand up and testify his abdication. Moawiyah did not approve of that motion, for he knew very well that it was superfluous for Hassan to acquaint the people with what they were all eye-witnesses of, and that if he did speak at all, it was more than probable that he would leave a sting behind him; but, overcome with Amrou's importunity, he at length commanded Hassan to do it. Then Hassan stood up, and having first praised God, said, "O people! God, whose name be magnified and glorified, directed you the right way by the help of the first of our family, and hath prevented the effusion of your blood by the means of the last of us. Moawiyah contended with me concerning a matter, to which I had a better pretension than he; but I chose rather to surrender it to him,

than to shed the blood of the people. But even this affair also hath a time prefixed for its duration, and the world is liable to changes." Which last words, as presaging a revolution, Moawiyah so disrelished, that he immediately commanded Hassan to sit down, and chid Amrou severely for his advice. Hassan before his departure, stood up and told the Irakians, that he had three things to lay to their charge:—The murder of his father, the affronts offered to his own person, and the robbing him of his goods. For, though Moawiyah had promised him the treasury of Cufah, they refused to let him have it, insisting that it was their property, and could not, therefore, be alienated without their consent.

However, it was no great loss to him, for Moawiyah, once possessed of the caliphate, which was the only thing he aimed at, never grudged him any amount of revenue he might require. He assigned him about a hundred and fifty thousand pounds a year, besides large presents. He and his brother Hosein retired, and lived privately at Medina. He spent most of his vast revenue in deeds of charity. So little was he attached to the things of this world, that twice in his life-time he stripped himself of all that he had; and three other several times he divided half his substance among the poor. His seal or motto during his caliphate was, "There is no God but God, the true and manifest King."

Authors differ as to the precise time of his reign; but most assign him about six months, or a little more. Upon his coming to Medina, Hassan was blamed by some of his friends there for having so tamely and easily resigned. To those who asked him what induced him to resign so easily, he answered, that he was weary of the world.

When he had made up his mind to resign, he began his speech to them with these words: "We are your commanders and your chiefs, and we are of the family of the house of your prophet, from which God hath removed pollution, and whom he hath purified;" there was not a man present in the congre-

gation but wept so loud that you might hear him sob. At his departure, too, from Cufah to Medina, they evinced their love and sorrow with tears.

Whilst Hassan was living at Medina, some of the Karegites, those heretics that had given his father so much disturbance, made an insurrection against Moawiyah, who wrote to Hassan, calling upon him to take the field against them. Hassan desired to be excused, and told him that he had relinquished the chief care of public affairs on purpose to avoid it; and that if he had cared for fighting at all, it should have been against him.

At last, in the forty-ninth year of their date, which falls in with the six hundred and sixty-ninth of ours, Hassan died at Medina, of poison, administered to him by one of his wives, Jaidah, whom Yezid, the son of Moawiyah, suborned to commit that wickedness, on the promise of marrying her afterwards.* But when the murder was effected, Yezid declined prudently to marry her, and rewarded her with 50,000 dirrhems, about £1,146 sterling.

Hassan was born at Medina, in the year A.D. 614, and was forty-seven years of age when he died. Hassan is said to have been in person very like his granfather Mohammed, who, when he was born, spit in his mouth and named him Hassan. Mohammed was used to express his fondness for his grandchild in his infancy after the strangest manner possible. And after he was a little older, when he was kneeling at prayers, he would encourage the little Hassan to come and clamber upon him; and to humour him, Mohammed would hold him on his knees, and prolong the prayers on purpose. Nay, sometimes, in the midst of a discourse to the people, if he saw Hassan and Hosein running towards him, he would come unto them and embrace them, and

* The method which this woman adopted for the accomplishment of her design was not less remarkable than its consummate perfidy. Upon an occasion of anointing her husband's person after the bath, she used a napkin which she had previously impregnated with poison. The subtle preparation soon pervaded the frame of Hassan, and speedy and inevitable death was the consequence. It is stated, on respectable authority, that she had made five previous attempts without success.

take them up with him into the pulpit; then, making a short apology in behalf of their innocency and tender age, proceed in his discourse.

It is stated by an Arab historian "That the Syrians set up Moawiyah at Jerusalem, because there was none to oppose them, and that the Irakians set up Hassan against him, and would undoubtedly have succeeded in their attempt, but for their mismanagement and divisions among themselves.

Some of the Arab historians, treating of Hassan's death, assert that in the treaties between him and Moawiyah, it had been stipulated that Moawiyah should never declare a successor so long as Hassan lived, but should leave, as Omar had done before, the election in the hands of a certain number of persons, to be nominated by Hassan. Moawiyah therefore being desirous of leaving the caliphate to his son Yezid, and thinking he could not bring his design about so long as Hassan was alive, determined to get rid of him.*

THE DYNASTY OF THE OMMIADES.

With the death of Hassan, the son of Ali, all opposition to Moawiyah, the mortal enemy of Ali, being over, Moawiyah took possession of the whole caliphate. And with this event commenced the dynasty of the Ommiades, in the year of the Hegira 41, A.D. 679.

Moawiyah reigned nineteen years in the caliphate, and enjoyed the government of Syria nearly forty years. He had been in early life the secretary of Mohammed; that he was ambitious, treacherous, and unprincipled, there can be no doubt. But the Arab historian extols (and probably with justice) his munificence

* Moawiyah, with all his munificence and liberality, taste for learning, and generous encouragement of learned men, had some Saracen vices of no ordinary turpitude. He had a custom of getting rid of those who troubled his repose or thwarted his schemes of ambition, by poison, secretly administered, or assassination similarly executed. Those savage instincts of his were probably derived from his mother. We are informed by Weil that "Moawiyah was called the 'son of the liver-eater,' because, after the battle of Ohud, his mother Hind, finding the body of Hamza, Mohammed's uncle, amongst the slain, immediately tore out his liver, and eat it in her rage."

and liberality, his love of learning, and patronage of learned men. He died A.D. 661.

This caliph was buried in Damascus, where he had established the seat of the caliphate; and that city always retained this prerogative of dignity so long as the Ommiades, or defenders of Moawiyah, reigned. In the time of the Abbasides, it was transferred to Anbar, Haschemyah, and Bagdad.*

The first and greatest schisms in Islamism (says Ockley) proceeded from the contest for temporal rule, and the faith shared the dismemberment of the empire. We have already remarked the existence of the two great political and religious factions, the Motasali and Khavaredj, the apostates and the deserters, many of whose tenets differed materially from those inculcated by the ruling doctrine; but particularly that opinion which they maintained with arms, in respect to the right to the dignity of khalif and imam. This is the origin of most of the sects of Islamism, and is the fertile root from which has grown the many-branched stem of heresy.

No less than seventy-two sects are counted, according to a tradition of Mohammed, who is said to have foretold that his people would divide into seventy-three branches, of which one only is the true one, all the rest being erroneous. A very instructive sub-division and enumeration of them is found in Sheristani and also Macrisi, to which Silvestre de Sacy first directed public attention, in a treatise read by him to the Institute of France. We shall be satisfied with considering merely the two stems into which the tree of Islamism, as soon as it rose above the ground, bifurcated, and which even now, after the growth of twelve hundred years, still remain the two principal limbs which have given birth to the confused sectarian ramifications. These two divisions are the doctrines of the

* Mills, in reference to the duration of the Ommiades, says: "From the middle of the seventh to a like period of the eighth century of the Christian era (a space of about ninety-two years) the family of Moawiyah were invested with the regal and sacerdotal office. This dynasty is called the dynasty of the Ommiades, from the caliph Moawiyah or Ommia, the first of the house, the son of Abu Sofian, the successor of Abu Taleb, in the principality of Mecca."

Sonnites and the Schiites, which though otherwise multifarious, differ from each other principally in this,—that the former recognise as legitimate, the succession of the four first caliphs, the latter only acknowledge the rights of Ali and his descendants. The Sonnite is shocked by the murder of Osman, and the Schiite is revolted by the slaughter of Ali and his sons. What the one execrates, the other defends; and what the latter receives, the former rejects. This exactly diametrical opposition of most of their dogmas became only the more decisive by the lapse of time, and the separation of political interests of the nations which subscribe to them.

The Sonnites, whose doctrine is considered among us the orthodox one,—all the delineations of the Islamitic system, hitherto published in Europe, having been derived from Sonnitic authorities,—are again divided into four classes; these differ from each other in some non-essential points of ritual ceremony: as, for example, the ritual of the Roman Catholic church, differs from the rituals of the united Greek, Armenian, and Syrian churches. In essential dogmas, however they agree. These four thoroughly orthodox sects of the Sonnites, are named after the four great imams, Malek, Shaffi, Hanbali, and Abu Hanife, who, like the fathers of the church stand at their head. The four principal sects of the Schiites, are the Kaissaniye, Seidiye, Ghullat, and Imamie.

The Persian free-thinking doctrines made their way into Arabia, in the time of the Abbasside caliphs. These doctrines being found subversive of all religion, principle, and morality, its professors were called Sindik (libertines), a word corrupted from Zend, the living word of Zerdusht. Their first appearance in Islamism was in the commencement of the caliphate of the family of Abbas, of whom the first caliphs in vain endeavoured to eradicate them with the sword. The eastern provinces of the ancient Persian empire, whither the remaining adherents of the ancient dynasty and form of worship had taken refuge, and whither Islamism had, as yet, scarcely penetrated, were the fertile sources of these heresies so fatal to the imamat and ca-

liphate. Thus, in the reign of the caliph Manssur, A.D. 758, the Rawendi, who maintained the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, revolted; and twenty years afterwards, A.D 778, under the command of Abdol Kahir, the Mohammer (*i. e.* the red, or the ass-like), so called, either because they wore red clothes, or because they called the true believers asses (the Arabic root Hamara meaning both he has been red and he has been an ass); and in the same year, in Transoxana, the Sefid-jamegan, or white dressed, founded by Hakem Ben Hashem, called Mokanna the concealed, from wearing a golden mask; or Sasendeimah (*i. e.* the moonshine-maker), because he, at night, produced a miraculous illumination from a well at Nakhsheb, which caused the place to appear to be lighted by the moon, set up their sects. By this juggling Mokanna wished to attest his divine mission, as by a miracle; as Mani had proved the celestial origin of his, by the divinity of art, namely, with a book adorned with splendid paintings (Ertengi Mani). Mokanna taught that God had assumed the human form since he had commanded the angels to adore the first man; and that since that period, the divine nature had passed from prophet to prophet, to Abu Moslem, who had founded the glory of the Abbassides, and descended lastly to himself. He was a disciple of Abu Moslem, who was acknowledged by the Rawendi as their head, and who seems to have been the first to introduce the doctrine of transmigration into Islamism. Mokanna added to the metempsychosis (Tenasukh), the incarnation of the human and divine nature, a dogma originating in India, and afterwards adopted, as we have seen above, by the Ghullat as one of their principal tenets.

"In the reign of Maimun, the seventh Abbasside caliph, when translations, and the invitation to Bagdad of the literati of Greece and Persia, had caused the seeds of science, already planted, to bloom in full luxuriance,—the spirit of the Arabian, which was now imbued with the systems of Grecian philosophy, Persian theology, and Indian mysticism, shook off, more and

more, the narrow trammels of Islamism. The appellation of Mulhad (athiest), and Sindik (libertine), became constantly more and more common with their cause, and the wisest and best informed of the caliph's court, were thus stigmatised. In the first year of the third century of the Hegira, arose a revolutionary sectarian, who, like Masdek, two centuries and a half before, in Persia, preached the indifference of actions, and community of goods, and menaced the throne of the caliph with ruin, as his prototype had that of Chosru. Babek (the originator of the sect of the assassins), surnamed Khurremi, for a space of twenty years, filled the whole circuit of the caliph's dominions with carnage and ruins, until, at length, in the reign of Motassem, he was overthrown, taken prisoner, and put to death in the caliph's presence, A.D. 837. Babek, before he delivered his captives to the axe, caused their wives and daughters to be violated before their eyes; and, it is said, that, in his turn, he received the same treatment from the commandant of the castle in which he was imprisoned. When his hands and feet were struck off, by order of the caliph, he laughed, and smilingly sealed with his blood, the criminal gaiety of his tenets. The number of those who fell by the sword in twenty years, is estimated by historians to amount to a million. And one of his ten executioners boasted he had himself butchered 20,000 men, so terrible and sanguinary was the conflict between the assertors of liberty and equality, and the defenders of the caliph's throne, and the pulpit of Islam."

At this epoch, about A.D. 841, there lived at Ahwas, in the southern part of Persia, Abdallah the son of Maimum-Kaddah, a son of Daasan, the Dualist. By his father and grandfather, who had introduced Dualism, from the system of the Magi into that of Islamism, he was educated in the principles of the ancient empire and faith of the Persians; and stimulated to deeds, by which, if he could not accomplish their re-establishment, he might at least achieve the overthrow of those of the Arabians.

Profoundly versed in all the sciences, and taught by the

study of history, and the dire experience of his own day, Abdallah, the son of Maimun, had sufficient opportunity to perceive the risk of declaring open war against the established religion and reigning dynasty. He determined, therefore, by a deeply laid plan, to undermine in secret, that which he dared not attack openly. As, however, it was Abdallah's design to annihilate, not merely the prejudices of positive religion and authority, but to aim at the very foundation of all, he resolved to promulgate his doctrines gradually, and divided them into seven degrees, after the fashion of the Pythagorean and Indian philosophers. The last degree inculcated the vanity of all religion, — the indifference of actions, which, according to him, are neither visited with recompense or chastisement, either now or hereafter. He appointed emissaries whom he despatched to enlist disciples, and to initiate them, according to their capacity for libertinism and turbulence, in some or all of the degrees. The pretensions of the descendants of Mohammed, the son of Ismail, served him as a political mask ; these his missionaries asserted as partisans, while they were secretly but the apostles of crime and impiety. Under these two relations, they and their followers were sometimes called Ismailites, and sometimes Ibahie, "*indifferent.*" Abdallah proceeded from Ahwas to Bassra, and thence to Syria, where he settled at Salemiye: and from this place his son, Ahmed, and Ahmed's sons, Abulabbas, and Mohammed Sholalaa, and his envoys (Dai), at once emissaries and missionaries, spread forth his doctrines. The most celebrated of the latter was Hossein of Ahwas, who, in the country of Kufa, initiated, amongst others, Anmed, the son of Eshaas (called Karmath), in the mysteries of revolt and infidelity, of which he soon gave an earnest to the world, in torrents of blood, and the smoking ruins of cities.

He called himself Karmath, and became the leader of the Karmathites, who, issuing from Lahssa and Bakhrein, like the Wahabees, nine hundred years afterwards, menaced Islamism with destruction. His doctrine, in addition to the circumstance of its forbidding nothing, and declaring everything allowable

and indifferent, meriting neither reward nor punishment, undermined more particularly the basis of Mohammedanism, by declaring that all its commands were allegorical.

The Karmathites differed from the doctrine of Abdallah, the son of Maimum, in hoisting the standard of revolt, instead of, according to the secret system, waiting their time tranquilly, till the throne should be occupied by one of their number, and openly taking the field against the existing power of the Caliphate. The contest was sanguinary, like that of Babek twenty years before; but more tedious and dangerous both to the altar and the throne. Even Khalif Motadhadbillah, who strengthened, with the iron remedy of the sword, those nerves of the Caliphate, so deplorably enfeebled since his sixth ancestor, Motewekul, and received in history the name of the second founder of the Abassides, Seffahssanni, the second blood-spiller,—Abbas being the first,—was unable, with all his energy, to extirpate this pernicious brood. Karmathite commanders of military genius and courage, such as Abusaid, Jenabi, and Abutaher, guided the mailed arm of the Karmathites against the head and heart of Islamism. Under the conduct of the latter, the Karmathites in the year 920 A.D. took the holy city of Mecca, as the Wahabees have done in our own days,—so little novelty do such doctrines and deeds possess in the history of Mohammedanism. Thirty thousand Moslimin fell in defence of the sanctity of the Kaaba against its impious assailants, who set fire to the temple, and carried away to Hadjar even the black stone said to have fallen from heaven in the time of Abraham. This stone was an aërolite, and for that reason, like many others, an object of popular veneration. It was restored, after a lapse of twenty-two years, when the Emir of Irak redeemed it at the price of fifty thousand ducats. For a whole century the pernicious doctrines of Karmath raged with fire and sword in the very bosom of Islamism, until the wide-spread conflagration was extinguished in blood.

The fate of the Karmathites, like that of the followers of Babek, was a bloody lesson to those initiated into the secret

doctrines of Abdallah, the son of Maimun-Kaddah, not to propagate them otherwise than covertly until they should be masters of the throne itself. At length, one of their most zealous partisans, the Dai Abdollah, a pretended descendant of Mohammed, the son of Ismail, succeeded in escaping from the dungeons of Sejelmessa, in which he had been confined by order of the Khalif Motadhad, and seated himself on the throne in Africa, under the name of Obeidollah Mehdi. This adventurer was the founder of the dynasty of the Egyptian khalifs, who tracing their descent to Ismail, son of Jafer Sadik, and from him to Fatima, the prophet's daughter, are known by the name of the Fatimites, or eastern Ismailites. Thus the name, which hitherto had designated a sect, was applied to a race. Ismailitism, which governed as a ready tool the founder of the dynasty it had placed on the throne, was, in Africa, in every sense, the predominant doctrine, and the Caliph throne of Mahadia, the first residence of these princes, soon threatened that of Bagdad. It was from that ancient metropolis of the Caliphate that proceeded the allegations against the purity of Obeidollah's extraction.

Immediately after the establishment of the monarchy of the Fatimites, in 977 A.D., history mentions secret assemblages, which were convened twice a week, every Monday and Wednesday, by the Daial-doat, and were frequented in crowds both by men and women, who had separate seats. These assemblages were named Mejalisol-hikmet, or Societies of Wisdom. The candidates for initiation were dressed in white; the chief went on those two days to the Caliph, and read something to him, if possible, but in every case received his signature on the cover of his manuscript. After the lecture, the pupils kissed his hands, and touched the signature of the Caliph reverently with their foreheads. In the reign of the sixth Fatimite khalif, Hakem Biemvillah, (the most stupid tyrant of which the history of Islamism makes mention, who desired to receive divine honours, and what is still more absurd, is to this day worshipped by the Druses as an incarnate god), these societies,

the house in which their meetings were held, and the institutions for the maintenance of teachers and servants, were increased on a very large scale: an extensive building or lodge was erected, A.D. 1004, called Darol-hikmet, or the House of Wisdom, and richly furnished with books, mathematical instruments, professors and attendants; access, and the use of these literary treasures was free to all, and writing materials were afforded gratis. The khalifs frequently held learned disputations, at which the professors of this academy appeared, divided according to their different faculties—logicians, mathematicians, jurists, and physicians, were dressed in their gala costume, khalaa, or their doctoral mantles. The gowns of the English universities still have the original form of the Arabic khalaa or kaftan.

Two hundred and fifty-seven thousand ducats, was the amount of the annual revenue of this academy, for salaries of professors and officials, provision of requisites for teaching, and other objects of scientific instruction, as well as of the secret articles of faith: the former comprised all the branches of human knowlege—the latter inculcated in nine successive degrees, the following principles: The first degree was the longest and most difficult of all, as it was necessary to inspire the pupil with the most implicit confidence in the knowledge of his teacher, and to incline him to take that most solemn oath, by which he bound himself to the secret doctrine with blind faith and unconditional obedience. For this purpose, every possible expedient was adopted to perplex the mind by the many contradictions of positive religion and reason, to render the absurdities of the Koran still more involved by the most insidious questions and most subtle doubts, and to point from the apparent literal signification to a deeper sense, which was properly the kernel, as the former was but the husk. They inculcated the recognition of divinely appointed imams, who were the source of all knowledge. As soon as the faith in them was well established, the third degree taught their number, which could not exceed the holy seven; for, as God had created

seven heavens, seven earths, seven seas, seven planets, seven colours, seven musical sounds, and seven metals, so had he appointed seven of the most excellent of his creatures as revealed imams: these were, Ali, Hassan, Hossein, Ali Seinolabidin, Mohammed Albakir, Jafer Assadik, and Ismail, his son, as the last and seventh. This was the great leap or the proper schism from the Imamie, who, as we have seen, reckoned twelve, and considerably facilitated the passing into the fourth grade. This taught, that since the beginning of the world there have been seven divine lawgivers, or speaking apostles of God, of whom each had always, by the command of heaven, altered the doctrine of his predecessor. The coadjutors of the lawgivers were called Mutes.

The first of the Mutes was named Sus, the seat as it were of the ministers of the speaking prophet. These seven speaking prophets, with their seven seats, were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, and Ismail, the son of Jafer, also called the Lord of time. Their seven assistants were Seth, Shem, Ishmael, son of Abraham, Aaron, Simeon, Ali, and Mohammed, the son of Ismail. This dexterous arrangement gained the Ismailites the name of Seveners, that as they named only the first of the mute divine envoys in each prophetic period, and since Mohammed, the son of Ismail, the first of the last prophet's coadjutors had been dead only a hundred years, the teachers were at full liberty to present to those whose progress stopped at this degree, whomsoever they pleased, as one of the mute prophets of the current age. The fifth degree taught that each of the seven mute prophets had twelve apostles for the extension of the true faith; for the number twelve is the most excellent after seven: hence the twelve signs of the zodiac, the twelve months, the twelve tribes of Israel, the twelve bones of the fingers of each hand, the thumb excepted, and so on.

After these five degrees, the precepts of Islamism were examined; and in the sixth it was shown, that all positive religious legislation must be subordinate to the general and philosophical. The dogmas of Plato, Aristotle, and Pythagoras were laid down

as axioms. This degree was very tedious, and admission was granted after long studies to the seventh, where he passed from philosophy to mysticism. This was the doctrine of unity, which the Sofis have exhibited in their works. In the eighth, the positive precepts of religion were again brought forward, to fall to dust by all that preceded; then was the pupil perfectly enlightened as to the superfluity of all prophets and apostles, the non-existence of heaven and hell, the indifference of all actions, for which there is neither reward nor punishment in this world or the next; and thus was he matured for the ninth and last degree, to become the blind instrument of all the passions of unbridled thirst of power. To believe nothing and to dare all, was, in two words, the sum of this system, which annihilated every principle of religion and morality, and had no other object than to execute ambitious designs with suitable ministers, who, daring all and honouring nothing, since they consider everything a cheat and nothing forbidden, are the best tools of an infernal policy."

So the sect of the Assassins, of Satanic origin, was established, professedly for the promotion of the interest of high state policy, of philosophy, and morality, and it maintained its ground for upwards of two centuries in Syria and Persia.

CHAPTER V.

The Tartar Race—Turcoman Tribes—Seljukian Turks—Origin of the Ottoman Empire.

THE Turks (a race altogether differing from the Saracens) derive their origin from the roving barbarians of the mountains of Tartary. The entire vast region that is called Tartary, extends from north to south from 500 to about 1000, and from east to west nearly 5000 miles. This Tartar region, the source of innumerable barbaric irruptions, migrations, and excesses, from time immemorial has been peopled by pastoral tribes of various races (Scythian, Sarmatian, Hun, Mogul, Turcoman, &c.), but of similar habits, modes of life, predatory tastes and occupations, tendencies to war, rapine, and devastation.

In these various Tartar races, the Scythian element predominates perhaps in the Turcoman tribes, to which the Turks owe their origin.

"Pomponius Mela reckons the Turks (says old Fuller) among the inhabitants of Scythia, near the river Tanais. This Scythia, since called Tartaria, was a virgin country, never forced by foreign armies, nor the monarchs who counted themselves conquerors of the world (by a large Syndechdoche taking the sixth part for the whole) never subdued it. Alexander sent some troops to assault Naura and Gabaza, two out countries thereof, as an earnest that the rest of his army should follow; but hearing how these were welcomed, willingly lost his earnest, and disposed of his army otherwise. The Roman

eagles flew not so far, and though heard of, were never seen there. The reason that made the Turks leave their native soil, was the barrenness thereof; and, therefore, the poet maketh famine (which sometimes travelleth abroad into other countries) here to have her constant habitation.

"But the people, scorning that their ground should be better civilised than themselves, never manure it, and had rather provide their bread with the sword than with the plough. Other partial causes might share in this removal of the Turks; *but the cause of causes was the justice of God*, that suffered this unregarded people to grow into the terror of the world, for the punishment of Christians. Yet we may justly hope, that when the correction is done, the rod shall be burned; especially finding, as we do, already the force of this empire to abate, being at this day, stopped in its progress, by the half kingdom of Hungary, which formerly could not be stayed by the whole kingdom of Greece. The next step these Turks took out of their own country, was into Turcomania, a northern part of A menia, conquered and so called by them, where they lived like the Scythian Nomades, always wandering, yet always in their way, none claiming a property in the land as his, all defending the common interest therein as theirs. The next step was into Persia, whither they were called to assist the Saracen sultan against his enemies; where, taking due notice of their own strength and the Saracen's cowardice, they (the Turks), under Tangrolipix, their first king, overcame that large dominion. Then did the Turks take on them the Mohammedan religion, and having conquered the Saracens by their valour, were themselves subdued by the Saracen superstition—an event more memorable, because not easily to be paralleled (excepting in the case of King Amaziah, who, having conquered Edom, was himself taken with the idolatry thereof), and because conquerors usually bring their religion into the country they subdue, and do not take it thence.

"Their third large stride was into Babylon, the caliph whereof they subdued. And shortly after, under Cutler Musis, their

second king, they won Mesopotamia, the greatest part of Syria, and the city of Jerusalem. Meanwhile these vultures—the Turks and Saracens—pecked out each other's eyes. The Christians, if they had husbanded this occasion, might have much advantaged themselves, and might have recovered their health by these contrary poisons expelling each other. But the Grecian emperors, given over to pleasure and covetousness, regarded not their own good, till, at last, the Turks devoured them."*

That "old storehouse of nations," the Sythia of ancient times, and, according to Diodorus Siculus, the region whose people are of a more ancient origin than those even of Egypt—now generally known as Tartary,—includes a territory of vast extent, differently circumstanced in regard to climate, soil, and population. from north to south from five hundred to a thousand miles, and probably from east to west from 4,000 to 5,000 miles. The people of the vast plains of Tartary, from the earliest time of which there is any record, have led a wandering, pastoral marauding life; mounted shepherd nomades or predatory hordes moving in great masses, traversing spaces of large extent, suddenly collected for purposes of war, for rapid movement or migration on a gigantic scale, making descents usually southward or westward, as if by some law of necessity inherent in their circumstances, on countries included in their own territory, or far beyond its limits, with astounding swiftness and irresistible impetuosity, devastating provinces, destroying in a single *raide* and *razèe* towns and cities and vestiges of civilisation, which took perhaps as many centuries to perfect and accomplish as to bring into that decayed condition which the Tartar element of destruction swept away, sparing nothing of which Time had left a trace. They came with the fury and violence of a torrent, and they went back to their native wilds of the north with the swiftness of a tempest, moved by some headlong impulse of uncontrollable energy, that seemed inexplicable and even awful

* "The History of the Holy Warre." by Thomas Fuller. D.D., Prebendary of Sarum. Third Ed. Cam., 1647. Book i., ch. 8.

to those who witnessed their sweeping incursions and sudden disappearances and dispersions.

Their climate and their soil equally tended to inspire their roving, restless, predatory propensities. The inclemency of the climate of vast regions of Tartary is attributed to its elevated position, distance from the sea, impregnation of the soil with nitrous and other salts, and of the atmosphere with exhalations from it. Trees, forests, cultivation, reclamation of waste lands, it is needless to say, have no existence in those extensive plains where a dreary desert is the rule, and an oasis of verdure of more or less extent, flat, unbroken, undefined grazing grounds are the exception. The cold is bitter, and at certain seasons far more severe than it is in some more northern European countries.

The three highways of the Tartars in their southward and westward incursions and migrations have been across the Danube, the Oxus, and the Caucasus. The Turkish-Tartar trains have always migrated or made their incursions southward into Europe and Asia Minor by the defiles of the Caucasus and Circassia to the westward of the Caspian, or by the east of the Aral; and it has been observed that those hordes of Turcomans who penetrated southward by the Caucasus and Circassia, and eastward of the Caspian, remain unchanged, in their new places of settlement, in habits, propensities, and pursuits; while those Turcomans, now designated Turks, who have taken a different course, and proceeded southward, to the east of the Aral, have progressed towards a state of semi-civilisation (beyond which, however, they have never gone), and become conquerors, founders of empire, and shown some aptitude for civil government.

In the sixth century a Tartar-Turcoman sovereignty was in existence, extending from the Caspian towards the Indus. The Romans sent an embassy thither, and in the seventh century their tribes on the Caspian were known to the Greco-Roman Emperor of Constantinople, Heraclius, who entered into engagements with them for the defence of his territories bordering on Tartary.

This ominous alliance, strange to say, dates from the beginning of the Mohammedan religion, from about the era of the Hegira. Heraclius was then at war with Persia, and while the Christian prince was making an alliance with Pagans, the Persian sovereign was in alliance with the barbarous tribes of Christian Europe—the Russians, Sclavonians, and Bulgarians.

The Emperor Heraclius solicited the service of a horde of these Turcomans, who were distinguished from other tribes by the name of Chozars, and at his solicitation the Turcoman Chozars came with their usual accompaniments, families, horses, cars, flocks, and herds, from the Volga, by the passes of the Caucasus into Georgia. Nothing could exceed the honour with which the Pagan horde of barbarians and their leaders were received by the Christian emperor.

He distributed gold amongst them; made presents of sumptuous apparel and other precious things, to their chiefs; and, actually, in the height of his exultation, or in the depth of his debasement, he took the imperial diadem, which had been worn by Constantine the Great, and placed it on the head of the Pagan Tartar, who had brought him an auxiliary force of 40,000 horse.

In the course of a few centuries the impetus given by the Emperor Heraclius to Tartar migration, by his first introduction into his dominions of the Turcoman tribes, may be attributed irruption after irruption into the Asiatic, and even into the European provinces of his empire. When these tribes were first known to history, they were located chiefly in a hilly district, rich in mineral productions, connected with Mount Altai, the most celebrated of the mountains of Tartary. Among the metals, iron was found in most abundance. Mines for obtaining the metals had existed from the earliest ages, and were worked at the time the Tartar Huns were over-running Gaul and Italy in the 5th century.

The Turks are represented at that period as a tribe of serfs in a state of servitude, employed by a more powerful tribe as

workers of the ore, and as blacksmiths. Fifty years had not elapsed before these serfs, or slaves, on the downfall of the Huns, becoming soldiers, conquerors, possessors, and lords of vast territories, entered into relations of state with the greatest powers then in existence.

An intermediate independent Turcoman power started into existence between the times of Attila and Zingis, which endured about two centuries, though not above 90 years in the same region. The Turcomans' migrations and irruptions in Georgia, Circassia, and the Greco-Roman provinces of Asia Minor, were productive of no lasting influences on their habits, manners, and pursuits. They were neither subjugators nor subjugated, but tolerated barbarian auxiliaries, in some instances, highly-favoured, and well-rewarded mercenaries; and therefore their characters were less affected by external circumstances than they would have been had they been exposed to the vicissitudes of fortune, to which their brethren of the race of Ihman subjected themselves.

Their adoption of the religion of Mohammed had no effect on their minds or habits; it was merely received by them, without their manifesting the slightest zeal or fervour. We find them at this day, in Asia Minor, on the borders of Syria, in their own Tartary, in Bokarra, the ancient Sogdiana, very nearly in the same condition, and following the same pursuits they did at the earliest periods of their history, and we observe by a comparison of the most recent accounts of travellers, with those of writers of the last century, that no change whatever has taken place in their condition or character.

But this observation applies, in many respects, also to the Tartars of the same tribes, who have become conquerors and rulers amongst the Ottoman Turks.

Whatever improvement has taken place in the Turkish character and external conformation, may be attributed, in the first instance, to the habit they contracted during their first occupation of Sogdiana, for the period of ninety years, of intermarrying with races more polished than their own. In later

times, the practice that prevails, at least among the grandees of the Turkish empire, of marrying Georgian and Circassian slaves, has no doubt tended to soften down their Tartar characteristics. The change effected in Sogdiana, in their aspects and form, had a singular effect on their destiny. When the Saracens established their power there, at the end of the seventh century, and reduced the Turks in that country about 705, the Turks were recommended to their masters, by their comely and portly appearance, for purposes of war or ostentatious display, either as slaves or captives, or mercenary soldiers. This was the case not only in Sogdiana, but in the Saracenic provinces of Persia; and when the caliphate was removed from Damascus to Bagdad, in 762, the Turks occupied the same position in that city, and a little later we find them enrolled as guards of the caliph, and appointed to the highest civil offices in the State, governing provinces, commanding armies, and influencing the affairs of the court itself. One of the remarkable characteristics of the Turks was, that wherever they gained a footing amongst foreigners, and were treated with kindness, received with hospitality and liberality, and had privileges and honours conferred on them, they invariably turned on their benefactors, rebelled against them, and either murdered or drove them out of their own land.

From 862 to 870 they took possession of all offices of the state, tyrannized over their masters, rebelled against the caliph, burst on him unexpectedly in his palace, murdered him, and cut his body into seven pieces. Seizing on the symbols of power, civil and religious, the cloak and staff of Mohammed; they made and unmade caliphs at will, and in four months elevated to the caliphate no less than three caliphs, whom they deposed and murdered: murdered them, too, with signal barbarity, by prolonged modes of death, inflicting insults and blows on their victims. At length the people of Bagdad rose against these outrageous mercenaries, subdued and banished them from the city; but in their folly they allowed them to disperse over the country and settle in it, and thus becom

so many nuclei of treason. A little later we find the empire of the Saracens dying out in Sogdiana, and a little later still destroyed. The Turks were yet there and in Persia, filling high offices, and exercising great influence; and eventually the whole power of the Saracens in Sogdiana fell into the hands of the Tartar-Turkish rebellious governor of Khorassan. The dynasty founded by this rebel governor in Khorassan and Sogdiana, commenced in 997, was designated the dynasty of the Gaznerides, so called after Gazneh, or Ghirznee, a great city, and lasted about two hundred years. The great monarch of this dynasty, Machmoud, commenced his career of wars and conquests in 997, surpassing all his predecessors in the splendour and magnificence with which he surrounded his court and seat of empire, which eventually was fixed in Hindostan—one of the countries he had conquered. He was the first Tartar ruler upon whom the title of sultan was bestowed. The accounts given of the amount and value of his loot, in the course of his wars in Hindostan, are almost incredible. The little stroke of loot business, by the armies of two great Christian sovereigns in China, at the close of the year of grace, bears no comparison with the enormous swag of Machmoud.

Of that ancient and most renowned in sacred history, of that Armenia over which the Turcoman hordes of Tartary now roam as masters, or tread on the heels of other tribes and races as barbarous as their own, a few words by a recent traveller may be of some use. In a German work of great merit, "Sketches of the nations and races between the Black Sea and the Caspian," by the Baron von Naxthausen, the old land of the Armenians is thus noticed:—

"Among the famous localities of the world, none other, perhaps possesses so many points of varied and permanent interest historical, and ethnological, as that which extends between the Black and Caspian Seas, bounded on the north by the glaciers of the great Caucasian range, and on the south by Mount Ararat. Many suppose this country to have been the birth-place of the earliest race of mankind, of whom we possess Scriptural

record; others there are who, with more reason, are disposed to believe that the garden of Adam, the bowers and waters of Eden, were placed further to the eastward—in the great Messopotamian plain between the Euphrates and Tigris—a supposition, indeed, indicated by Sacred Writ. That, however, the plain around Ararat is the point from which the post-diluvian immigrations of mankind radiated, after the subsidence of the Deluge, is a fact memorized by history, sacred and Pagan, and illustrated by the correlative testimony afforded by the physical aspect of the region.

"To this region the traditions of all civilised nations turn; and while it is memorable historically as the starting point of the human race, it is remarkable as the locality in which their finest physical types are preserved—the Indo-Germanic people who possess Europe, and who have created modern civilisation, being proud to trace their original in the semi-savage but splendid warriors of Georgia and the Caucasus. A hundred myths of antiquity are connected with this region, and are still found preserved in the popular legends of its inhabitants.

"Many ages before the Christian era the eastern shores of the Black Sea were covered with Grecian colonies, who traded extensively with the East. Then followed the Roman dominion, which lasted until the fifth century, when the multitudinous invasion of the Huns drove the inhabitants into the mountain fastnesses. In this latter period of the Byzanthian empire, Armenia and Georgia became flourishing kingdoms, enriched by the Oriental commerce, of which they remained masters until the middle ages, when the Genoese, of whom so many structural monuments remain in the mountains of Circassia, established settlements around the south and eastern coasts of the Black Sea. This people, after numerous contests with their commercial rivals, the Venetians, were expelled from Asia by the Turks. For a period Mohammedanism almost extirpated Christianity: a long age of barbarism succeeded, during which the Georgian and Armenian provinces became the battle-field of the Osmanlis and Persians, between whom

constant wars were sustained until the Russian conquest, which eventuated in the renaisance of Christianity, and the introduction, on a still limited scale, of the civilization of the West.

"Circassia and Georgia are, at the present day, inhabited by innumerable races, many of which are found to preserve their ethnological individuality in the seclusion of small mountain villages. Throughout the Caucasian region and southern provinces, no less than seventy original tongues are spoken.

"From its relation to the primitive history of man, Armenia is one of the most interesting localities in the world. The legends of many countries point to this region as that from which the nations of Europe emanated, and while it was for many ages the high road of the world's commerce, it became in successive periods the battle-field of the Assyrians and Persians, the Romans and Parthians, and many other nations. Here occurred the great Arabian victory at Navahend, which gave them the dominion of the east; here the military power of Europe stopped in the Crusades. Here also, in modern time, has been waged, and is still waging, the battle between Mohammedanism and Christianity—between Persia and Turkey on one side, and Russia on the other. At present a comparatively small portion of this people, who were the first Asian race, who as a nation embraced Christianity, inhabit their native land. Dispersed over the world, they constitute a great mercantile community, and from their extraordinary facility in acquiring language—a faculty they possess in common with the Russians—have become the linguists of the East. Their original tongue, which they assert was that spoken by Noah, and which bears the same relation to that now in use as the Latin to the Roman, is so singularly flexible and perfect in structure, that it is found to possess greater capacities as a translating medium than any existing tongue—indeed, the translated literature of Armenia is more extensive than any other. The roots of this language, which, like all those of Indo-Germanic origin, are monosyllabic, and in its construction

correspond with the Tartar; it is, however, quite distinct from the Semitic, in which latter the words never commence with a vowel sound, which is one of the chief characteristics of the ancient Armenian.

"Until the year 406, when Stellescop invented the alphabet, Armenian remained a spoken tongue; immediately after this, however, we find the Armenians possessing a most extensive literature, of which the fifth and sixth centuries were the brightest and most productive period. Then, parts of the original works of Armenian genius are theological, and even their historical works have invariably a theological background; their philosophy consists almost exclusively of dogmatic disquisitions, and their poetry of sacred songs akin to that of the Hebrews. Their early bards were chiefly of the ecclesiastical order; but at the present day, and for many centuries, there has existed in Armenia a guild of master singers, composed, strange to say, exclusively of blind men, whose only occupation is that of the versifier and story-teller. The members of this Homeric body wander about the country, challenging each other for poetic contests, for the amusement of the people. Sometimes a portion of the Koran or Bible is proposed for versification; sometimes the contest consists in the dramatic interchange of witty repartee. In both cases the improvisation which is vocalised, and accompanied with the music of a guitar, is composed in the Tartar, which is especially the language of song, the Armenians never poetising in their own. Ritter, the geographer, asserts that in the vicinity of Ararat national songs are still sung, which date their composition from the fifth and sixth centuries. Numerous heroic ballads also are said to exist in manuscript, many of which celebrate the same heroes and exploits as are found in the Sha Nameh of Firdousi—a fact which appears to indicate a very remote relation between the Armenian and Persian nations.

"Transcaucasia, as defined by the last treaty of peace between Russia, Turkey, and Persia, embraces the entire region between the Black and Caspian Seas, comprising Mingrelia Immeritia

on the west, Georgia in the centre, Armenia on the south, Daghestan and Khaberdah on the north; Sherban and Karabagh on the east—its northern and southern limits being the rivers Terek and Aras. This region is now under the dominion of Russia, whose administration in the various provinces is of a military character, and who has established therein military colonies resembling those of the Romans. . . . Wherever they are established they form the nucleus of towns—a policy in which the Czars have but followed that of Alexander the Great, who, by planting colonies in the regions passed by his victorious armies, thus formed within two years in Asia—as Plutarch relates—upwards of forty towns, to which he gave his name. In Transcaucasia and Georgia, especially, the feudal system, in its most perfect form, still prevails; so that on a visit to those countries, the traveller is enabled to realise a complete idea of the life, manners, and customs of the middle ages of Europe.

"Among the many tribes of the Caucasus, the Ossites, who inhabit its middle regions, are singular from the strong resemblance which exists between their customs and those of the ancient Germans described by Tacitus. This people, evidently a branch of the Alaric, though partly professing Mohamedanism and partly Christianity, are in reality semi-Pagans. Like the Germans, they have their sacred groves and caverns, in which they offer sacrifices and thank offerings of bread and flesh to Elijah, who is recognised as the prophet and guardian of their nation. The graves of their ancestors are held in great reverence. In their burials the corpse is always placed with the head to the west—thus indicating, doubtless, the region from which their original migration proceeded. Many of their customs, as regards hospitality, marriage, blood revenge, are identical with those of the Ostiaks—those remains of the ancient Goths; and though their language bears a nearer affinity to the Persian than German, their tone and manner of enunciation has struck travellers, from its similarity to that of the Saxons. Another strange tribe is that of the Yezidis, who lead a nomadic

life in the regions around Ararat. This people, although Monotheists, pay special adoration and offer constant sacrifices to the evil principle, Satan, by whom they believe the world was created. Should any one in their presence speak ill of the ruined Archangel, they are bound to slay either him or themselves. These and other Pagan doctrines and rites are evidently traceable to the Persian worship of Ahrimanes. But the variety of creeds in Transcaucasia is almost as great as the number of its races. Of Islamism and Christianity, Circassia and Armenia are the principal centres; many denominations of Paganism, however, tinctured by both the prevailing creeds, are found among the tribes of the great mountain range, while on its eastern limit, on the shores of the Caspian, the Fire Worship of ancient Persia still prevails to some extent."

Volney, with his usual perspicuity, insight into character, and accurate knowledge, especially of all the races of the Turkish Empire, observes:—

"The Turcomans are of the number of those Tartar hordes, who at the great revolution of the empire of the caliphs, emigrated from the eastward of the Caspian Sea, and spread themselves over the vast plains of Armenia and Asia Minor. Their language is the same as that of the Turks, and their mode of life nearly resembles that of the Bedouin Arabs. Like them, they are shepherds, and consequently obliged to travel over immense tracts of land to procure subsistence for their numerous herds. . . . Their whole occupation consists in smoking and looking after their flocks. Perpetually on horseback, with their lances on their shoulders, their crooked sabres by their sides, and their pistols in their belts, they are expert horsemen and indefatigable soldiers. . . . A great number of these tribes pass in the summer into Armenia and Caramania, where they find grass in great abundance, and return to their former quarters in the winter. The Turcomans are reputed to be Moslem, but they trouble themselves little about religion."*

* Volney, Travels in Syria, &c., vol. i. 369.

Chandler, in his "Travels in Asia Minor," describes them as he found them between Smyrna and Ephesus, about the middle of last century:—

"We were told that the road further on was beset with Turcomans, a people supposed to be descended from the Nomades Scythæ, or Shepherd Scythians, busied, as of old, in breeding and nurturing cattle, and leading, as then, an unsettled life, not forming villages and towns with stable habitations, but flitting from place to place, as the season, and their conveniences direct; choosing their stations and overspreading without control the vast neglected pastures of this desert empire. . . . We set out, and soon after came to a wild country covered with thickets, and with the innumerable black booths of the Turcomans, spreading on every side, with flocks, and herds, and horses, and poultry feeding round them."

In the Universal History, the Tartars are described as of eastern and western tribe; the eastern, we are told, "are tall and robust, with square flat faces, like those of the western, only they are more swarthy, and have a greater resemblance to the Tartars. Some have betaken themselves to industry. They are all Mohammedans and are very turbulent, very brave, and good horsemen." The western tribes are Turcomans, and are described as pastoral, roving marauders and freebooters, always at war with the Kurds, tributary to the Porte, but having no respect for its rule, Mohammedans, caring little for the law of Islam, but strongly attached to old traditions, some of which connect their tribes with two princes, heads of distinct sovereignties of former ages, on the borders of Armenia.

In 1853, when preparations for making war between Russia and Turkey were being carried on, the able correspondent of the *Times* newspaper at Constantinople, gave a graphic account of the Turcoman tribes, their analogies with the Turks, and of both with the common Tartar stock.

"From the coast of the Black Sea," he writes home, "to the Taurus chain of mountains, a great part of the population

is nomad, and besides the Turks or Osmanlis (that is, the Ottoman or Imperial Turks), consists of two distinct races:—the Turcomans, who possessed themselves of the land before the advent of the Osmanlis, and who wander with their black tents up to the shores of the Bosphorus; and the Kurds. . . The Turcomans, who are spread over the whole of Asia Minor, are a most warlike people. Clans, numbering many thousand, acknowledge the Sultan as the representative of the caliphs, and the Sovereign Lord of Islam, from whom all the Frank kings receive their crowns; but they are practically independent of him, and pay no taxes but to their own chiefs. In the neighbourhood of Cæsarea, Kusan Oghlou, a Turcoman chief, numbers 20,000 armed horsemen, rules despotically over a large district, and has often successfully resisted the Sultan's arms. These people lead a nomad life, are always engaged in petty warfare, are well mounted, and armed with pistol, scimitar, spear, or gun, and would always be useful as irregular troops."

But let us return to these early hordes of Tartars. It is well to bear in mind that the empire and ravages of Attila and his Huns extend over a period of twlve yeaers, from A.D. 441 to 452. For six centuries more other Scythian marauders followed in their track.

Soliman, the Tartar-Turkish Sultan of Roum, established himself at Nice in 1082.

The Empire and conquests of Zingis Khan, and the Moguls, date from 1176 to 1259.

The Empire of the Turks was founded by Othman, 1301.

The Empire and conquest of Timour extend from 1370 to 1405.

The Tartar power of Attila, Zingis Khan, and Timour, may merit the name of Empire, but it is hardly appropriate to the combined powers of barbarism of other Tartar leaders who at various times exercised for brief periods a precarious authority over a certain number of those tribes belonging to the original combination. The term sovereignty or empire is wrongly applied to them.

When we reflect on the terrible ravages in the east and in the west, of Attila, of Zingis Khan, and of Timour, of the immense hordes which these scourges of the human race were able to pour down on China, India, Persia, Rome, and all its provinces; Spain, Sicily, on the Greco-Roman empire, and all its possessions in Romania, Anatolia, and Syria, hordes to be estimated not by thousands, but by millions in the aggregate; when we reflect on the flourishing towns and cities, civilized kingdoms, and miriads of human beings swept away by these multitudinous barbarians of Tartary, we are led to enquire—Can similar irruptions and catastrophes ever occur again, at least in civilized countries? One of the ablest and most eloquent writers, and profoundest thinkers of modern times, has indeed told us:

"Barbarism is ever impending over the civilized world. Never, since history began, has there been so long a cessation of the law of human society, as in the period in which we live.

"Such is the fearful provision for havoc and devastation, when the Divine Word goes forth for judgment upon the civilized world, which the North has ever in store; and the regions on which it has principally expended its fury, are those whose fatal beauty, or richness of soil, or perfection of cultivation, or exquisiteness of produce, or amenity of climate, make them objects of desire to the barbarian."*

Barbarism, indeed, is always impending, but never again, in human probability, will it pour down on the civilized world from the same "storehouse of nations," so long, at least, as Tartary remains in its barbarism, and the civilized realms of the earth possess resources for the employment of disciplined standing armies, and for the use of rifled cannon, and all the highly improved modes of destruction at the command of great European states. The perils impending over old civilized countries in Europe, are to be apprehended from bar-

* Lectures on the History of the Turks, by the author of "Loss and Gain," 1854.

barism that has become semi-civilized from the Russian descendants of Tartars, perhaps not greatly superior in enlightenment to their Tartar ancestors, but living under rulers combining all the civilization of modern times with the old instincts and traditions of their race, ever tending to territorial aggrandizement, never departing from the policy pursued for that purpose, and never daunted by any impediments in its path, or necessary temporary suspension of its designs from resuming them at the first convenient opportunity.

When the Huns migrated in the 5th century into Europe from Tartary, some of their hordes struck off from the main body soon after they had set out, and determined on making a settlement south of the Jaxartes, and finally came to a country called Sogdiana: in the middle ages called Transoxiana, and now known as Bokhara, a country in all ages celebrated for the excellence of its climate, soil, and position. In this country is included the territory of Khorassan, ancient Bactria, and the region between the Oxis and the Caspian, called Kharsni. Here the Huns, above referred to, took up their abode. It has been called "the paradise of Asia," the climate surpassing every other of that continent in its temperature, and especially when compared with the sudden transitions in northern Tartary, from extreme heat to extreme cold. Samarcand is the metropolis of Sogdiana, a city of vast importance, long before, and some centuries subsequently to, our era. It had been the emporium of the trade of Hindostan and China with the Western world, and when the Huns settled in Sogdiana, Samarcand had many vestiges of the civilization of former ages—the civilization connected with the names of Cyrus, Alexander, and the Græco-Bactrian kings. These vestiges of civilization in Samarcand and Bokhara survived the occupation of the Huns, and were not only preserved by the Saracens during their later occupation, but served to stimulate those settlers to promote learning and many useful arts; and so late as the last century a university still existed in Samarcand, frequented by Mohammedan

youth from foreign countries, and of a considerable number of colleges some were remaining and attended by Mohammedan students. The ruins of an observatory of celebrity in the middle ages, still existing, attests the civilizing character of the Saracenic rule.

A nobler monument is this than the tomb, once enriched with precious gems, under whose lofty dome Timour, the great destroyer of men and devastator of nations, sleeps in the same city—the metropolis of his native land—in that city which had been his imperial seat; and even in his time, after the ravages of his terrible predecessor, Zingis, could boast of many remains of its former greatness and magnificence.

The Tartar empire of the Huns, to the east of Mount Altai, the date of which was of an antiquity of an unknown period in the most ancient times, was in existence shortly before the Christian era. Little is known of these tribes, except that the genuine characteristics of all Tartar races were not wanting in them. Their lives were spent in marauding expeditions, invading, plundering, and devastating the territories of neighbouring tribes, and even realms far beyond their borders. The famous wall of China, 1500 miles in length, was raised for protection against the incursions of the Tartar Huns. But the great wall did not save the Chinese from becoming tributary to them until Providence was pleased to endow a Chinese emperor with energy never before that period exhibited in Chinese history, and certainly not since that time, accorded to a brother of the Sun, and sovereign of "the Celestial Empire."

This singularly energetic emperor, in the first century of our era, determined on invading the territories of the Tartar marauders. He entered their country at the head of an army of 140,000 men, traversed 700 miles of wilderness, and put an end to the power of the Huns in the East, at the cost of 110,000 men. From that time at least for some ages a new direction was given to their irruptions, and in less than two centuries they proceeded westward, and eventually found themselves in Europe.

In the fifth century a section of their hordes from which a mass of their main body had separated, at the setting out of their expedition westward and settling in Sogdiana, proceeded to the Danube, invaded the territory of the Goths to the north of that river, and spread terror and devastation over all the provinces of that part of Germany.

In 441 A.D. came Attila, "the Destroyer," the scourge of God, with his hordes, into Europe, and during twelve years the ravages of the Huns and their terrible leader desolated one province or another of the Roman empire.

An interval of 723 years separates the ravages of Attila in the west from those of Zingis Khan in the east, and commences in 1176.

Another interval of about two centuries separates the conquests and massacres of Zingis Khan from those of Timour, or Tamerlane, commencing in 1370. The outlines of these Tartar irruptions and devastations, the most signal in the records of history, at least since the Christian era, have been admirably grouped together by a man of master mind, not surpassed in learning or graphic power of delineation, in literary taste and philosophical turn of thought, in a work published in 1853, but, strange to say, little known, to which his name has not been given, entitled "Lectures on Turkish History," &c. To that work I am indebted for the facts, and in some instances to passages in which they are embodied, in relation to striking episodes in the career of the great Tartar Terrorists of the human race, but not in the order of their occurrence in that work, nor in the detailed form in which they are there given. Those who would desire to form any correct judgment of the excellence of that work, or even of the few pages of it which have reference to the career of the Tartar princes that are briefly noticed by me, must have recourse to the work itself.

"Nothing brings before us more vividly the terrible character of Attila than this, that he terrified the Goths themselves. The celebrated barbarians of the Hunnish tribes, in the time of Attila, inhabited the countries to the north of the Black Sea, between the

Danube and the Don, the very district in which Darius so many centuries before found the Scythians. They were impending over the Roman empire, and threatening it with destruction; their king was the great Hermanric, who, after many victories, was closing his days in the fulness of power and renown. That they themselves, the formidable Goths, should have to fear and flee, seemed the most improbable of prospects; yet it was their lot. Suddenly they heard, or rather they felt before they heard, so rapid is the torrent of Scythian warfare, they felt upon them and among them the resistless, crushing force of a remorseless foe. They beheld their fields and villages in flames about them, and their hearthstones deluged in the blood of their dearest and their bravest. Shocked and stunned by so unexpected a calamity, they could think of nothing better than turning their backs on the enemy, crowding to the Danube, and imploring the Romans to let them cross over, and to lodge themselves and their families in safety from the calamity which menaced them."

Indeed, the very appearance of the enemy scared them; and they shrank from him, as children before some monstrous object. It is observed of the Scythians, their ancestors, who came down upon Asia in the Median times, that they were a frightful set of men. "The persons of the Scythians," says a living historian,* "naturally unsightly, were rendered hideous by indolent habits, only occasionally interrupted by violent exertions; and the same cause subjected them to disgusting diseases, in which they themselves revered the finger of heaven." Some of these ancient tribes are said to have been cannibals, and their horrible outrage in serving up to Cyaxares human flesh for game, may be taken to confirm the account. Their sensuality was unbridled, so much so that even polygamy was a licence too restrained for their depravity. The Huns were worthy sons of such fathers. The Goths, the bravest and noblest of barbarians, recoiled in horror from their physical and moral deformity.

* Thirlwall: Greece, vol. ii. p. 196.

"It was the boast of Attila, that, where his horse once trod, there grass never grew again. As he fulfilled his terrible destiny, religious men looked on with awe, and called him the 'Scourge of God.' He burst as a thunder-cloud upon the whole extent of country now called Turkey in Europe, along a line of more than five hundred miles, from the Black Sea to the Gulf of Venice. He defeated the Roman armies in three pitched battles, and then set about destroying their cities. Three of the greatest, Constantinople, Adrianople, and another, escaped; but as for the rest, the barbarian fury fell on as many as seventy; they were sacked, levelled to the ground, and their inhabitants carried off to captivity. Next he turned round to the west, and rode off with his savage horsemen to the Rhine. He entered France, and stormed and sacked the greater part of its cities. At Metz he involved in one promiscuous massacre priests and children. He burned the city, so that a solitary chapel of St. Stephen was its sole remains. At length he was signally defeated by the Romans and Goths united at Chalons on the Marne, in a tremendous battle, which ended in 252,000, or as one account says, 300,000 men being left dead on the field."

Irritated, rather than humbled, as some beast of prey, by this mishap, he turned to Italy. Crossing the Alps, he laid siege to Aquileia, took it, sacked it, and so utterly destroyed it, that the succeeding generation could scarcely trace its ruins. He turned back, and passed along through Lombardy; and as he moved he set fire to Padua and other cities; he plundered Vincenza, Verona, and Bergamo, and sold to the citizens of Milan and Pavia their lives and buildings at the price of the surrender of their property.

This ferocious conqueror was stayed in the course of blood and fire which was carrying him towards Rome, by the great St. Leo, the Pope of the day, who undertook an embassy to his camp. There was that about him, in the noble aspect, and the spare youthful form, which portraits give to Pope Leo, which was adapted to arrest and subdue even Attila. He was sub-

dued by the influence of religion, and agreed to evacuate Italy.

"A few words will bring us to the end of his career. Evil has its limit; the Scourge of God had accomplished his mission. Hardly had St. Leo retired, when the barbarian king availed himself of the brief interval in his work of blood, to celebrate a new marriage. In the deep corruption of the Tartar race, polygamy is comparatively a point of virtue: Attila's wives were beyond computation. Zingis, after him, had as many as five hundred; another of the Tartar leaders had three hundred. Attila, on the evening of his new nuptials, drank to excess, and was carried to his room. There he was found in the morning, bathed and suffocated in his blood. An artery had suddenly burst; and as he lay on his back, the blood had flowed back upon his throat and lungs, and so he had gone to his place."

"Like the Huns, the tribes of Zingis and Timour came down from the north of Asia, swept over the face of the South, obliterated the civilisation of centuries, inflicted unspeakable misery on whole nations, and then were spent, extinguished, and only survived to posterity in the desolation they caused. As Attila ruled from China to the Rhine, and wasted Europe from the Black Sea to the Loire, so Zingis, and his sons and grandsons, occupied a still larger portion of the world's surface and exercised a still more pitiless sway. Besides the immense range of territory from Germany to the North Pacific Ocean, throughout which their power was felt, even if it was not acknowledged, they overran China, Siberia, Russia, Poland, Hungary, Anatolia, Syria, and Persia. During the sixty-five years of their dominion, they subdued almost all Asia, and a large portion of Europe. The conquests of Timour were as sudden and as complete, if not as vast, as those of Zingis; and if he did not penetrate into Europe, he accomplished instead the subjugation of Hindostan.

"The exploits of those warriors have the air of eastern romance; 700,000 men marched under the standard of Zingis;

and, in one of his battles, he left 160,000 of his enemies upon the field. Before Timour died, he had had twenty-seven crowns upon his head. When he invaded Turkistan, his army stretched along a line of thirteen miles."

"These two extraordinary men rivalled or exceeded Attila in their wholesale barbarities. As Attila vaunted that the grass never grew again after his horse's hoof, so it was the boast of Zingis, that when he destroyed a city, he did it so completely, that his horse could gallop across its site without stumbling. He depopulated the whole country from the Danube to the Baltic in a season; and the ruins of cities and churches were strewed with the bones of the inhabitants. He allured the fugitives from the woods, where they lay hid, under a promise of pardon and peace; he made them gather in the harvest and the vintage, and then he put them to death. At Gran, in Hungary, he had three hundred noble ladies slaughtered in his presence. But these were slight excesses compared with others of his acts. When he had subdued the northern part of China, he proposed, not in the heat of victory, but deliberately in council, to exterminate all its inhabitants, and to turn it into a cattle walk; from this project indeed he was diverted, but a similar process was his rule with the cities he conquered."

"What was his treatment of cities which had submitted to him at discretion? He ordered out the whole population on some adjacent plain; then he proceeded to sack their city. Next he divided them into three parts: the soldiers and others capable of bearing arms; these he either enlisted into his armies, or slaughtered on the spot. The second class consisted of the rich, the women, and the artisans; these he divided amongst his followers. The remainder, the old, infirm, and poor, he suffered to return to their rifled city."

"The three great capitals of Khorassan were destroyed by his orders, and a reckoning made of the slain; at Maru were killed 1,300,000; at Herat, 1,600,000; and at Neisabour, 1,747,000; making a total of 4,647,000 deaths. Say these numbers are exaggerated four-fold or ten-fold; even on the last supposition

you will have a massacre of towards half a million of helpless beings. After recounting such preternatural crimes, it is little to add that his devastation of the fine countries between the Caspian and the Indus, a tract of many hundred miles, was so complete, that six centuries have been unable to repair the ravages of four years."

Timour equalled Zingis, if he could not surpass him, in barbarity. At Delhi, the capital of his future dynasty, he massacred 100,000 prisoners, because some of them were seen to smile, when the army of their countrymen came in sight. He laid a tax of the following sort on the people of Ispahan, viz.: to find him 70,000 human skulls, to build his towers with; and, after Bagdad had revolted, he exacted of the inhabitants as many as 90,000. He burned, or sacked, or razed to the ground, the cities of Astrachan, Carisme, Delhi, Ispahan, Bagdad, Aleppo, Damascus, Broussa, Smyrno, and a thousand others. We seem to be reading of some antedeluvian giant rather than of a medieval conqueror.

"The terrible races which I have been describing, like those giants of old, have ever been enemies of God and persecutors of Christianity. Celts, Goths, Lombards, Franks, have been converted, and their descendants to this day are Christian; but, whether we consider Huns, Moguls, or Turks, up to this time they are in outer darkness. And accordingly to the innumerable Tartar tribes, and to none other, have been applied by commentators the solemn passages about Gog and Magog, who are to fight the battles of Antichrist against the faithful. 'Satan shall go forth and seduce the nations which are at the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, and shall collect them to battle, whose number is as the sea sand.'"

"It is remarkable that the three great conquerors, who have been our subject, all died in the fulness of glory. From the beginning of history to our own times, the insecurity of great prosperity has been the theme of poets and philosophers. Scripture points out to our warning in opposite ways the fortunes of Sennacherib, Nabuchodonosor, and Antiochus.

"But the Tartars finished a prosperous course without reverse; they indeed died and went to judgment, but, as far as the visible scene of their glory is concerned, they underwent no change. Attila was summoned suddenly, but the summons found him a triumphant king; and the case is the same with Zingis and Timour. These latter conquerors had glories besides of a different kind which increased the lustre of their reigns. They were both lawgivers; it is the boast of Zingis that he laid down the maxim of religious toleration with a clearness, which modern infidels have considered to rival the theory of Locke; and Timour too established an efficient police in his dominions, and was a patron of literature. Their sun went down full and cloudless, with the merit of having shed some rays of blessing upon the earth, scorching and withering as had been its day. It is remarkable also that all three had something of a misgiving, or softening of mind, miserably unsatisfactory as it was, shortly before their deaths. As to Zingis, as, laden at once with years and with the spoils of Asia, he reluctantly measured his way home at the impatient bidding of his veterans, who were tired of war, he seemed visited by a sense of the vanity of all things, and a terror for the evil he had done. He showed some sort of pity for the vanquished, and declared his intention of rebuilding the cities he had destroyed. Alas! it is ever easier to pull down than to build up. His wars continued; he was successful by his lieutenants when he could not go to battle himself; he left his power to his children and grand-children, and he died.

"Such was the end of Zingis, a pagan, who had some notion of Christianity in a corrupted form, and who once almost gave hopes of becoming a Christian, but who really had adopted a sort of indifference towards religious creeds altogether."*

Another Tartar Turk, marauder, and man-slayer, on a grand scale, was Mahmoud the gazuwide, whose tribe had founded a dynasty in Khorassan and Sogdiana, so early as 977 A.D.

* Lectures on Turkey.

This Mahmoud was the first Tartar-Turkish leader to whom the title of Sultan was given (which we have corrupted into Soldan), and which subsequently the Ottoman sovereigns assumed. This famous conqueror commenced his career of carnage, which history dignifies with the title of glory, A.D. 997. A period of nearly five centuries and a half separates Mahmoud, the scourge of God in Hindostan, from Attila, the scourge of God in the Roman empire in Europe.

Of the four Tartar terrorists above referred to, particularly celebrated for their atrocities in their several great and little wars, Mahmoud appears to have had the largest dash of genius in his composition, and the largest share of grandeur in his conceptions. These advantages are not to be attributed to the Mohammedan religion, which nearly all the magnates of Tartary and many of its tribes had embraced, and certainly without any improvement in their moral being, that could be attributed to its influences. The three ruling passions of the Tartar moral nature are, and always have been, sensuality, rapacity, and a rage for blood-shedding. Most assuredly the Mohammedan religion is not calculated to control these passions; on the contrary, the law of Islam is specially designed, and admirably framed, to foster them and to clothe them with religious sanctions; nay more, this new religion of the Tartars could not fail to fix, and to make permanent, the brutalizing tendencies of those passions. The new doctrine of fatalism, which that religion enjoined, caused the Tartars to deify as it were those habitual views of their character, and to glorify themselves in them. If there be any doctrine more specially deserving than another of the designation of devil-doctrine, it is that which, by reconciling men to their worst passions, makes them enamoured of them, and of themselves—makes them self-worshippers. Other races, differently constituted, the Saracenic tribes especially, were not deteriorated by their new creed when they embraced Mohammedanism; on the contrary, all things considered, they were improved by their change of faith, to some extent, in their moral character, and

to a considerable one in their mental condition. But here difference of race made all the difference in the varied influences of the same religion embraced by nations differently constituted. The Turks and Tartars, from their stupidity, bowed down their minds to the Mohammedan faith with an implicit belief, not only in the doctrines, which were better than their own, but likewise in all that were of a degrading nature in Mohammedanism, and many were more detrimental to humanity than any tenets they formerly professed. So that this Tartar-Turkish race, in whom animal propensities and brutalizing instincts became firmly established, by means of their new religion were rendered bigots and fanatics in it. But this was not the case with the Saracens : their national pride was enlisted on the side of their countryman's religion.

They accepted it, or acquiesced in it; not because they believed implicitly in all its doctrines, or some even of its fundamental ones; for their prophet was no sooner dead, than the mantle of his sacred character was torn to pieces by his followers and successors. In every Arab house there was a controversy, and in every tribe a heresy, in some two or three heresies ; nay, within thirty years of the death of Mohammed, there were no less than seventy-two heresies; and if it be true that not only the time for these events, but the exact number of them, was foretold by Mohammed shortly before his death—which fact, however, I venture to doubt, without offence to the modern advocates of Mohammedanism—then the arch impostor, for once in his life, predicted what actually came to pass. Once for all, I may observe that there is this essential difference between the Saracens and the Tartar-Turkish races: the Saracens have an interior national life, a salient spring within them of energy and originality, of self-reliance, self dependence, and of confidence in their own resources, which rendered them always prepared for either fortune. Their character rather resembled that of the Greeks than that of any eastern people, and it is possible that the Greek element may have entered into it to some extent from the period that Alexander visited their country, and so-

journed in it, as we are told by Herodotus, for some time, and meditated the foundation there of his future seat of empire. The Turks, on the other hand, even at this day, although their moral and physical features have undergone some change, and in course of ages of migrations and vicissitudes of fortune, have been superficially improved, rendered grave and dignified, and capable of organising governmental institutions that may endure for centuries, and have already endured for upwards of four hundred years, they still have their original Tartar elements in them, and resemble and represent as unmistakably the Tartar hordes of Zingis Khan and Timour, as the latter represented the Scythians of the time of Herodotus. The Turks have no interior national life, no internal sources of confidence in their own energies, or the stability of their institutions, and they feel that they are only encamped in the midst of Europe, and civilisation is really incompatible with their occupation of any country, because it seems incompatible with their religion.

Sultan Mahmoud, fortunately for Europe, turned his Tartar hordes to the east instead of the west, and, perhaps fortunately for himself, preferred the spoiling of Hindostan to that of Christendom.

He ravaged, subdued, and plundered the principal territories, cities, shrines, and temples of Hindostan, and the *loot* he carried away was enormous. The accounts given of it must be read with deep interest by the statesmen and great military commanders of those two Christian powers who have lately carried their victorious arms to the capital of China, plundered the emperor's summer palace, and then burned it and its vast precincts for the satisfaction of offended Christian honour.

The Christian looters of Chinese palaces were not so successful as the Tartar spoilers of the Temples of Hindostan. But it is evident that the armies of those Christian powers did not want the will to rival the pillaging exploits of the Tartar Sultan; they lacked only fitting opportunities of conquest for carrying that will into execution. In a single instance Mahmoud looted

jewels strung round the neck of a prisoner, the Prince of Lahore, valued at three hundred and twenty thousand pounds of our money. At Mutra he loaded a hundred camels with the gold and silver melted down, of which the idols were made, which fell into his hands. His great loot, however, was in the famous temple of Somnauth, between the Indus and Bombay.

In the centre of the great temple the stone idol stood, that was more reverenced than all the idols of Hindostan. The Mohammedan conqueror, Sultan Mahmoud, in his zeal for his new religion, mace in hand, walked up to the stone god, and, to the horror of the pious Brahmins, demolished the idol's nose. They ventured to entreat him to stay his sacrilegious hand; they tried to bribe him; they offered him a sum of money equivalent to ten millions sterling, to abstain from further outrage on their deity. This offer was at first too much for Tartar virtue to withstand, but after a short struggle with his cupidity, he manifested his magnanimity and piety in a few emphatic words, to the effect, that it was more meritorious to destroy idols than to make money by them; so he commenced operations anew with his iron mace, and after many blows succeeded in making a breach in the trunk; what he evidently must have suspected, was discovered by him, the idol was hollow, and the divinity that was found to dwell within it was a treasure of precious gems and jewels of inestimable value. The famous sandal wood gates of the temple were carried away as a trophy by the conqueror, and after his death they served for his tomb near Guzneh, as trophies of his former power. His tomb at Guzneh was also ornamented with his formidable mace, but some pious robber, covetous of relics, stole the sacred emblem of Sultan Mahmoud's authority, and a Christian Governor, in later times, animated by sentiments of tender solicitude for the pious feelings of the poor idolators of Guzerat, whose ancestors had been so outraged by this Mohammedan Sultan, who eight centuries and a half previously, had carried away the sacred gates, and restored them to their rightful owners, the idolators of Guzerat. This great achievement was the result of our victories in Affghanis-

tan, and in a proclamation of the Governor-General, was communicated "to all the princes, chiefs, and people of India." This exploit was set forth as a signal vindication of the great national wrong sustained at the hands of Sultan Mahmoud. In a few years, however, the princes, chiefs, and people of India, shewed in an unmistakeable manner, that it was not the wrongs of eight and a half centuries ago that occupied their minds, at the hands of their Mohammedan conquerors, but those which they endured at the hands of their Christian rulers in the past and present century. This proclamation of Lord Ellenborough was censurable only for being a little bombastical, but it met in England, in press and Parliament, an overwhelming amount of virtuous indignation, none of which found expression there when other proclamations of his predecessors, and even of his most popular successors, announcing depositions of native princes, confiscations of vast provinces, and annexations of whole kingdoms, have been published in Hindostan, and well received at home.

We are told there was a sort of melancholy grandeur about the close of the career of this great Mussulman conqueror. It seems to me, however, there was more of misery than of magnanimity about it. When Mahmoud found he was dying, he began to speculate on the transitory nature of the enjoyment of vast worldly possessions, of which, perhaps no man living at the time possessed so large a share. Overwhelmed with the thought that his glory was coming to an end, that all the *swag* he had gained in his great wars must remain behind him, that he could carry away nothing with him of those treasures for the acquisition of which he had lived without peace or quiet in this world, the unfortunate old man, two days before his death, commanded his servants and officials of his palace to bring forth from his treasury, his vast riches, his heaps of gold and silver, his precious gems and caskets of jewels of great value, and deposit them in his chamber, so that he could gaze on them from his sick couch, and having enjoyed the sight of them for the last time, he began to weep. This was the magnanimity of a

dying Turkish conqueror, for, be it remembered, the Gaznevide dynasty of this Tartar prince was a Turkish one.

He wept because these riches could not be coffined with him, but he could not bring himself to part with any portion of them. The old ruling passion for war and rapine was not yet extinguished in his breast. The next day he had himself lifted from his couch, he caused his army of 150,000 men to be marshaled before him, he had his chariots, his camels, his war elephants, one thousand three hundred in number, brought forth, and was deeply affected, again shed tears, and then allowed himself to be carried back to his palace, and the following day he died. Such was the end of a prince who was always prosperous, during a reign of upwards of thirty years, who had known no adversity, for his exceeding great calamity, for no visitation of God's wrath is so signal in this world as that which falls suddenly and unforseen on the head of uniform good fortune, unbroken health, and unclouded glory.

The Sultan Mahmoud sleeps well in Guzneh after life's *fighting* fever. Treason, too, has done its worst in his dominions, and Lord Ellenborough in his tomb. Nothing further can touch him in this world. Dante has assigned a special stygian region for the *manes* of great warriors and ravagers of different nations; and if Dante be right, Sultan Mahmoud's shade must certainly find itself in the company of the ghosts of Sesostris, Cyrus, Alexander, Cæsar, Attila, Zingis, Khan, Timour, Cromwell, and Bonaparte, and all the great captains of later times, who waged what are called just and necessary wars. When Sultan Mahmoud was first embarking in his Indian wars, he allowed a large body of Turcoman hordes to settle in his dominions. Eventually these settlers took service under him, and garrisoned forts in his territory against his western enemies; but before Mahmoud's death, it was found that these Turcoman hordes had become formidable to the Sultan's power, and that two hundred thousand could be brought into the field. The year before his death they

rebelled against one of his lieutenants, and defeated his forces in a bloody action. But this was only a partial success, they were defeated in their turn, and during the remainder of Mahmoud's life, they were too wary to rise against him. But, with their accustomed perfidy, no sooner was the Sultan Mahmoud dead, than they rebelled against his son, and eventually deprived his dynasty of one half the empire. Thus by perfidy these Turkish hordes obtained a settlement in Sogdiana and Korassan; then by similar means they deprived the dynasty of the Gaznevides of half their empire; and they played the same game in Bagdad and in Persia against the Saracens.

It was in 985 that a Turcoman chief, of the name of Seljuk, had sought a shelter in Sogdiana, and obtained a settlement in Bokhara. His father had been the first of his tribe to embrace the Mohammedan religion. He was a fanatic, and he manifested his zeal among the Saracens in endeavouring to foment religious wars, in one of which, with a pagan horde, he was slain at the good round age of 107. This Seljuk was survived by four of his sons, who became rich and powerful. Seljuk's grandson, Togrul Beg, in 1048 gave such consistency to the strength of the Turcoman tribes in Tartary, that the destiny of his race seems to have been determined by his conduct from that date. Togrul introduced vast numbers of Turcoman hordes into his territory, on the condition of their embracing the Mohammedan religion. The Saracen caliph, who was then nominally the civil as well as spiritual ruler of the empire was sunk in sloth and sensuality, and all the civil power was really then in the hands of Togrul, and eventually he was publicly declared vicar of the prophet Mohammed. Soon after he married the caliph's daughter, made a little war on his own account against his own brother, defeated and strangled him, and then returned home in the fulness of his prosperity. He was the first Sultan of the Seljukian dynasty, he had carried his wars into the Greek provinces of Asia Minor,

from Silesia to Armenia, sweeping away the Christian populations wherever he came, and extending the massacre of them along a line of march of six hundred miles. On which account Togruls' memory for sanctity and devotion to the law of Islam is held in great veneration by all good Mussulmans. This pious Turcoman Sultan was succeeded by his nephew Arslan second Sultan of the Seljukian line. He renewed the holy war in Asia Minor, penetrated to Cesarea, pillaged shrines and churches, then carried war into Armenia and Georgia, conquered the people of the Caucasus, then rushed down on Roumelia, encountered an army of the Greek emperor, defeated it, and took the emperor prisoner, who being brought before them was made to prostrate himself, and to kiss the ground beneath the Sultan's feet. After Arslan set his foot on the Emperor's neck, he bade him rise, patted him on the head, and gave him his life and liberty for a ransom. Arslan at this time was at the height of his power, only 44 years of age, had an army of two hundred thousand at his command, a court of twelve hundred nobles to shew the glory and splendour of his house: but the angel of death was hanging over him.

On his return to Tartary, he engaged in a war with some tribes of Turks who had rebelled against his authority. He received his death wound at the hands of a Carismian chief. When he was dying we are told that he gave expression to sentiments more honourable to him than his murderous wars in Armenia and Asia Minor:

"In my youth," he said, "I was advised by a sage to humble myself before God, to distrust my own strength, and never to despise the most contemptible foe. I have neglected these lessons, and my neglect has been deservedly punished. Yesterday, as from an eminence, I beheld the numbers, the discipline, the spirit of my armies; the earth seemed to tremble under my feet, and I said in my heart, Surely thou art the king of the world, the greatest and most invincible of warriors.

These armies are no longer mine; and in the confidence of my personal strength, I now fall by the hand of an assassin."

On his tomb an inscription was engraven, conceived in a philosophic spirit:—"O ye, who have seen the glory of Alp Arslan exalted to the heavens, repair to Maru, and you will behold it buried in the dust."

CHAPTER VI.

Othman, the Founder of the Ottoman Empire, and his immediate ancestors. 1288—1326.

THE old and honest "History of the Turks," by Richard Knolles,* has been the storehouse from which a vast number of modern writers—several of good repute—have drawn their materials for books and treatises on subjects connected with Turkish history. Many who have made large use of such materials make no mention of the work from which they are drawn. Others, who have dealt very largely and unscrupulously with the author's labours, have acted very unfairly towards him, depreciated his work, and spoken disparagingly of it.

Othman, the founder of the Turkish empire, was born circa 1260 A.D., came to the Turkish throne in 1360, and died in 1326, at Brusa, which important city of the Greeks had surrendered to him the year previously; and there Othman sleeps in what once was his grand sepulchre. Who was, and whence came, this valiant prince, with whose fame and the terror inspired by his successors, Christendom was filled for nearly five centuries? Old Knolles must answer these questions, in less

* Knolles' Turkish History was first published in folio, in 1610. It extended from the origin of the Ottoman empire to the end of the reign of Osman, the 10th sultan (inclusive), who was dethroned by the Janissaries, and put to death in 1622. The 8th edition, published in 1687, contains a continuation of the Turkish history down to the end of the reign of Mohammed IV.—1688.

words, however, than he delivers himself in that ponderous tome of "The Turkish History." The Tartar tribes inhabiting those regions which once formed the Armenian territory, had two sovereignties, one founded by Tangrolipex, in that portion of Tartar territory which became absorbed in the Persian dominions. This sovereignty had its head and hereditary chiefs in the principal men of a tribe or sept named Seljukians. The other sovereignty was in a tribe at Machan, not of the Seljukian family, but of the Oguzian sept, held in much respect among the Turcomans of those regions. The Seljukian tribe having suffered much from the hostile Tartars in their vicinity, and been driven out of their country, the Oguzian sept followed their example, and fled from Machan, with their sultan or emir at their head, to a once powerful chief of the Seljukian tribe, named Aladin, who had likewise fled from the hostile Tartar tribes, and sought an asylum in Roumania—Asiatica. There Aladin, son of Kai Nafreu, or, as the Greek called him, Cai Cosroe, had established himself by force of arms amongst the Greek Christian inhabitants. The Oguzian tribe from Machan were well received by their countryman, Kai Cosroe, and established themselves at first at Erzeroum, a city on the borders of Armenia and Cappadocia, with their wives and children, after the manner of the Tartar nomades, their ancestors. Their worldly possessions consisted of herds of cattle, poor tents, and cars covered with a coarse kind of cloth. They derived support from the pasturage of flocks, leading the lives of rude and sturdy nomades, not wedded to any place, but removing with their cattle, tents, and cars, from one place of pasturage to another, as the Turcomans of our time (of the same original Tartar stock as the modern Turks) are in the habit of doing. Solyman, the chief or prince of the Seljukian emigrants from Machan, removed from Erzeroum to Amasia, making continual wars on the Christians of that district, plundering and pillaging their country until he had subdued a large territory; and at length his Turkish colony became so weakened by constant warfare with the Christian inhabitants, that it became

necessary for him and his tribe to seek better fortune elsewhere, and ultimately to return to their own land. With this intention, passing through Syria, they came to the castle of Ziabar-Cala, near Aleppo, and there remained for some time, plundering and spoiling the country round their temporary resting-place. Their next and fatal encampment was on the banks of the Euphrates, which river it was necessary to pass, but there was neither bridge nor ford to enable them to proceed on their route. In vain Solyman spent several days in seeking a passage, but finding none, his disappointment rendered him desperate: to use the quaint words of old Knolles, "Stay there he would not, and to proceed he could not; his desire bid him go, but the great river said—not so." In his perplexities Solyman mounted his horse, dashed into the river, was carried down by the stream, and man and horse perished in the Euphrates. Solyman's body was found by his people, and buried with great lamentation near the castle of Ziabar-Cala, which not long before had been taken by him from the Christians. Some of his followers established themselves in the country adjacent to Ziabar, and others in the deserts of Arabia and Syria bordering on Damascus, whose descendants at this day are called the Damascene Turcomans; others returned back into the wilds of Roumelia, of whom are descended the Turcomans of Iconium and Anatolia, whose posterity still lead a nomadic life.

Tasso has devoted a stanza in his celebrated poem of "Jerusalem Delivered," to this Sultan Solyman:—

That Solyman, than whom there was not any
Of all God's foes more rebel an offender;
Nay, nor a giant such, among the many
Whom earth once bore, and might again engender;
The Turkish Prince, who, first the Greeks expelling,
Fixed at Nicæa his imperial dwelling.
And then he made his infidel advances
From Phrygian Sangar to Meander's river;
Lydia and Mysia, humbled in war's chances,
Bithynia, Pontus, hymned the Arch-deceiver;
But when to Asia passed the Christian lances,
To battle with the Turk and misbeliever,
He, in two fields, encountered two disasters,
And so he fled, and the vexed land changed masters.

Solyman left four sons, Sencur-Tekan, Jundogdis, Ertogrul, father of Othman, the founder of the Turkish Empire and Dunder. These four brothers, returning into Roumelia with that portion of the Oguzian Turks who had determined on proceeding thither, marched along the Euphrates till they came to a place called Pasin Ovasi, where Ertogrul and his brother, Dunder, with four hundred families, resolved on remaining and establishing a colony. The two other brothers and their followers, abandoned their project of proceeding to Roumelia, and having succeeded in passing the Euphrates, set out for Persia. Ertogrul, with his brother, and his three sons, after various, and many unsuccessful conflicts with the Christian inhabitants, determined on returning into Roumelia, and setting out came to Ancyra, and took possession of a plain, of about three days' journey from the city of Nice, in Bithynia, where the same evil fortune pursued him of continual warfare with the Christians. Reduced to great extremity, Ertogrul dispatched one of his sons to Aladin, the elder, a prince of Tartar origin, who had established himself in Iconium, with his colony of emigrant Tartars, where he reigned, honoured with the title of Padischa, and exercising the power of a great Sultan over a large territory in Roumelia Asiatica, requesting to be allowed to settle in that country, with his people, which request was graciously entertained, and some hopes given of its being granted. But the messenger had not long returned to his father, when the territory of Aladin was ravaged by a horde of Tartars, and in a conflict with him the forces of Aladin were in the utmost danger of defeat, when Ertogrul, with four hundred of his followers, suddenly appeared on the field with unlooked-for aid and completely routed the Tartar horde. The grateful Padischa highly commended the valour of Ertogrul, clothed him with a cloak of honour (in Eastern countries an especial mark of favor and distinction), and bestowed great rewards on his soldiers. Ertogrul was likewise granted the request he had made for himself and his people, to be allowed to settle in the territory of the Padischa, and Aladin likewise conferred on him a country

village called Suguta, and a mountainous district in the greater Phrygia, the former for a place of abode in winter, and the latter for nomade pursuits and the pasturage of their cattle in summer.

Such was the humble beginning of Turkish territorial power and aggrandizement. The wandering Oguzian Turcoman of Tartar origin, the herdsman and marauder, alternately pillaging and plundering wherever he came, and tending or removing his flocks from place to place, and eventually driven out of each settlement he had made, by the inhabitants whose country he had devastated, became the lord of a village and a large district, and in course of time a maker of great wars, a besieger and captor of considerable towns and castles. But when Sultan Aladin and his successor, and all the heads of the Seljukian family were depressed and wholly destroyed by constants incursions of Tartar hordes, old Ertogrul, with consummate prudence and moderation, contrived to retain undisturbed possession of his village of Suguta, and "contented himself therewith as with a kingdom," well beaten by the tempests of fortune, but not crushed, intimately acquainted with vicissitudes of all kinds, and capable in his extreme old age of drawing lessons of wisdom from them for the instruction of his sons, but especially of Othman, whose impetuous and warlike qualities had ample need of all the old man's philosophical teachings to temper that courageous spirit, for which the founder of the Ottoman empire was subsequently so greatly distinguished. Ertogrul spent with age, greatly beloved and honoured by his neighbours, by Christians, strange to say, as well as Turks, and venerated by all his Tartar race in Asia Minor on account of his rare virtues of patience, prudence, and moderation, ended his career in 1289 A.D. in his 93rd year, at Suguta, where he had long lived in honour, and was honourably buried.

Much confusion in the early history of the Turkish Sultans, and the accounts given of the origins of the later caliphs may be avoided by a clear understanding of the fact, that Aladin,

the so-called Sultan of Iconium, was the representative of the Seljukian Tartar tribe, established in Asia Minor about the middle of the thirteenth century. Ertogrul after the death of his father, Solyman, who died in 1237 A.D., though not his eldest son, was looked upon as the representative of the Oguzian family of Machan in Tartary, and subsequently in Roumelia Asiatica.

"There is a certain remarkable parallel and contrast between the fortunes of these two races, the Seljukian and the Ottoman. In the beginning of the twelfth century, the race of Seljuk was on the point of taking Constantinople, and overrunning the West, and did not; in the beginning of the fifteenth, the Ottoman Turks were very near taking the same city, and were withheld from taking it, and at length did take it, and have it still. In each case a foe came upon them from the north, still more fierce and vigorous than they, and humbled them to the dust.

"These two foes that came upon the Seljukian Turks and the Ottoman Turks respectively, are names by this time familiar to us; they are Zingis and Timour. Zingis came down upon the Seljukians, and Timour came down upon the Ottomans. Timour pressed the Ottomans even more severely than Zingis pressed the Seljukians; yet the Seljukians did not recover the blow of Zingis; the Ottomans survived the blow of Timour, and rose more formidable after it, and have long outlived the power which inflicted it.

"Zingis and Timour were but the blind instruments of divine vengeance. They knew not what they did. The inward impulse of gigantic energy and brutal cupidity urged them forward; ambition, love of destruction, sensual appetite, frenzied them, and made them both more or less men. They pushed eastward, westward, southward; they confronted promptly and joyfully every peril, every obstacle which lay in their course. They smote down all rival pride and greatness of man; and, therefore, by the law (as I may call it) of their

nature and destiny, not on politic reason or far reaching plan, but because they came across him, they smote the Turk." *

Solyman Shah (who perished in the Euphrates), the father of Ertogrul, was chief of a Turcoman tribe that had been settled for some time in Khorassan, and afterwards in Armenia. When his sons above-mentioned and their families and followers established themselves in Asia-Minor, the Seljukian-Turkish power, which had been at its height in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Armenia, and Syria, under Togrul Bey, Alp-Arstan, and Malek Shah, was at once broken down by external and internal enemies, the assaults of the conquering Moguls, and the evils arising from civil strife. A small additional territory, given to Ertogrul by the Seljukian Sultan Aladdin of Koniah, the ancient Iconium, named Eskischeer, which Aladdin dignified with the name of Sultan-œni, which signifies "The Foremost Man of the Sultan," situated in a country identical with the ancient Phrygia Epictelos, was the beginning of the dominions of Sultan Othman, the founder of the Turkish empire. Othman, a young man remarkable for his personal comeliness and bodily vigour, was only twenty-four years of age when he began to govern. His wars were at first against rival Turkish tribes; soon, however, they were directed against the strongholds, towns, and cities of the Greek empire in his vicinity, and at the close of the thirteenth century his power extended north and westward to the regions in which two of the chief cities of the Greeks, Brusa and Nicœa, are situated. About 1299, after an interval of some years' peace, he engaged in a fierce war with an emir of Caramania for the right and title of sovereignty over the whole Turkish population. But this war, carried in a desultory manner into Caramania, did not prevent him from waging continued contests with the Greek emperor, in which he was engaged during the last twenty years of his life. Othman's warlike propensities and proceedings were considered by his nearest friends and best councillors injurious to his interests

* Lectures on Turkish History.

and his state. One who had the best right to advise him—his aged and prudent uncle, Dunder—opposed a wild and daring project of his, calculated to combine the Greek princes and the other Turkish tribes in that part of Asia Minor against him, and by their league to bring ruin on his tribe. Othman, the worthy founder of the race which has given sultans to the Turkish empire, made no reply—he deliberately took his bow, and sent an arrow through the heart of his aged uncle. This murder seems to have given his followers a higher opinion of the energies of his character than they had entertained before.

Shortly after he gained a great battle over a regular army of the Greeks in the vicinity of Nicomedia, and during the six succeeding years he carried his successful warfare to the coasts of the Black Sea, and having taken several of the most important fortresses in the adjacent territories, encircled the cities of Brusa, Nice, and Nicomedia with chains of fortified posts. In 1326, when age and infirmity were pressing on him, and the young whelp Orchan of the old lion Othman was growing strong and fierce and terrible, Brusa was taken for the sultan by his hopeful son, and there, on his death-bed, he directed that his remains should be buried, and that the seat of empire should be established by his son. He died in 1326, in his 68th year, having possessed power as an independent ruler twenty-seven years, and authority as the chief of his tribe thirty-nine. Although the title of sultan is accorded to him in history, it was not claimed nor used by him or his two immediate successors. The title of emir, or prince, was that which he and they assumed. Othman had a magnificent tomb erected for his remains by his successor. This tomb, long the object of honor and veneration, has, during the present century, been destroyed by fire.

The founder of the Turkish Empire, whom we name Othman, is called Osman, by Turkish writers, and his people Osmanli. The term Ottoman, however, given to the Empire and the Porte is derived from the name of this first ruler of the whole Turkish family. A modern writer on Turkish history observes:

"Othman inherited the fanaticism of the desert, and when he succeeded to his father's power, he proclaimed a gazi, or holy war, against the professors of Christianity. Suddenly, like some beast of prey, he managed to leap the mountain heights which separated the Greek province from the Mohammedan conquests, and he pitched himself into Broussa, in Bithynia, which remained from that time the Turkish capital, till it was exchanged for Adrianople and Constantinople. This was the beginning of a long series of conquests lasting about 270 years, till the Ottomans became one of the first, if not the first power, not only of Asia, but of the world.

"These conquests were achieved during the reigns of ten great sultans, the average length of whose reigns is as much as twenty six years, an unusual period for military sovereigns, and both an evidence of the stability, and a means of the extension of their power. Then came the period of their decline, and we are led on through the space of another 270 years, up to our own day, when they seem on the verge of some great reverse or overthrow. In this second period they have had as many as twenty-one sultans, whose average reigns are only half the lengths of those who preceded them, and afford as cogent an argument of their national disorder and demoralization. Of these twenty-one, five have been strangled, three have been deposed, and three have died of excess; of the remaining ten, four only had attained the age of man, and these come together in the course of the last century; two others have died about the age of thirty, and three about the age of fifty. The last, the thirty-first from Othman, is the present sultan, who came to the throne as a boy, and is described at that time by an English traveller, as one of the most "sickly, pale, inanimate, and unmanly youths, he ever saw."*

* Formby's Visit to the East.

CHAPTER VII.

Orchan, second Sultan of the Turks. 1326—1359.

In the bed of the Euphrates sleeps old Solyman Shah, the great-grandfather of the founder of the Turkish empire. Under a domed tomb, near Sœgud, sleeps Solyman's celebrated son, Ertogrul: and at Brusa rests his son, still more celebrated than himself, Emir Othman, the founder of the Turkish empire. Orchan, the eldest son of Othman, succeeded to his father's sovereignty and possessions. One of his first acts was to appoint his brother Aladin his prime minister, inventing for him a title—vizier, which signifies bearer of a burden. Up to the time of Orchan a kind of semblance of gratitude and the shadow of vassalage to the Seljukian rulers of Koniah had been accorded by the descendants of the old Aghuzian-Turkish chief, who was indebted to Aladin, the sultan of Iconium, for an asylum, protection, privileges, and territorial possessions of great value. But, from first to last, it was the peculiar vice and master-passion of the Turkish tribes to repay benefits of great moment and advantage by acts of perfidy and baseness of corresponding magnitude. Orchan set out by asserting his sovereignty over all the tribes of Moslemin in Asia Minor and beyond its borders. He coined money with his effigy, had his name used in public prayer, and had special funds raised for supporting a standing army. Whether these things originated with the vizier, Aladin, or not, they were instituted in the

reign of Orchan, and therefore the merit of them must be accorded to the latter.

In the life of Orchan, second Sultan of the Turks, the son of Othman, Knolles states, "it is erroneously affirmed by some Latine Historiographers," that the practice of killing the sons of sultans on the part of a brother or father commenced during the reign of the first ruler of the Turks. Sultan Othman had three sons, the youngest of whom, Orchan, as they assert, murdered his two brothers, in order to secure for himself succession to the throne—"a practice," observes Knolles, "of late much used among the Turkish princes, but not before the time of Bajazet, first of that name, who was the first of the Turkish monarchs that embrued his hands with his brother's blood; whereas, before, they used all brotherly love to one another, as the most probable histories collected out of the Turks' own chronicles affirm."*

So far from the fratricidal policy of the Turkish sultans having been pursued by Orchan, we find him charging his brother Aladin with the civil administration of his government, and to that able administration Orchan was indebted for the principal glories of his reign. When we speak of the glories of Turkish rule, we must not consider too curiously their origin or nature; but we must refer to one glory of this reign particularly deserving of attention—the institution of janissaries,—destined to be for centuries the scourge of Christians of the East, and the terror of the sovereigns of the West. This institution is ascribed erroneously by Knolles to Amurath I.

Orchan commenced his long reign of thirty-one, or twenty-one, years, in 1326. He died, according to Knolles, about 1359, but, according to Von Hammer, in 1349 A.D. In what year of his reign the janissary institution had its origin is not stated, but there is evidence of its being in existence when the principal warlike operations of Orchan, were undertaken, in 1330.

In 1326, the first year of his reign, the city of Nicomedia

* Knolles' Turkish History, vol. i. p. 125, Ed. VI.

was captured by him. Broussa, as previously stated, had been taken by him in the preceding year, the last of the reign of his father, Othman.

In 1330, Nice (the city next in importance to Constantinople) surrendered to Orchan's son, Solyman Pasha.

In 1336, by the defeat of the Turkish Prince of Karasi, Berghami, the ancient Pergamus, and all its territory, including a large portion of the north-west of Asia Minor, were acquired by Orchan.

So that, at least twenty-three years before his death (if he died as Knolles states in 1359), he was in possession of Broussa, Nicomedia, Nice, and Pergamus.

During the last twenty years of his reign, we are told by the same authority, he made no wars, and consequently no conquests. In this interval of peace he occupied himself in organizing the plans and projects of civil and military institutions which his brother, the Vizier Aladin, had introduced, in founding mosques and schools, raising great public edifices—in short, in building up an empire. From 1336 to 1356, Orchan, with the exception of a few intervening periods of misintelligence, was at peace with the Emperor Andronicus and his successors. In 1346, the Emperor Catacuzene, in the profound debasement of his feelings, and perversion of his religious principles, gave his young daughter, Theodora, in marriage to Orchan, an old Moslem widower of three score years. Orchan came to Scutari to receive his bride, and to pay his respects to his imperial father-in-law; but no sooner had Orchan taken his departure for his capital, Broussa, than several hordes of Turks crossed the Hellespont, and pillaged many towns in Thrace. These marauders, however, were attacked by the Greeks in considerable force, and all were either killed, captured, or routed.

Another opportunity at this time was afforded Orchan of striking a blow at his father-in-law. He displayed his perfidy on this occasion in espousing the quarrel of John Paleologus, a son-in-law of the Greek emperor, and fomenting the civil war that was waged against the latter. Always faithful to the old

perfidious policy of his predecessors, Orchan struck a new blow at the Emperor of the Greeks. In the midst of the confusion and anarchy occasioned in Constantinople, by the civil war he had fomented, he caused his son, Solyman Pacha, to make a descent on the European side of the Hellespont, and to found a permanent establishment there.

This act of vast significance occurred in 1356. Solyman crossed the Bosphorous with only thirty-nine picked men from the armed force he commanded near the ruins of the ancient Cyzicus. He embarked with this small force on the Asiatic side of the Hellespont on board a Genoese bark and surprised the fortress of Izympe on the opposite coast. No sooner was the Greek fortress in the hands of the Turks, than reinforcements to the extent of three thousand men, were dispatched from the opposite Turkish territory. In these humiliating circumstances the worthless, vile, and degraded emperor, Cantacuzene, did not venture to remonstrate with Orchan or his son, on this perfidious seizure of an important fortress near his capital. On the contrary he made an appeal to the generosity of Orchan, for assistance against his rebellious son-in-law, Paleologus.

The *generous* Orchan of course hearkened to the pitiable appeal of the Christian emperor, and immediately dispatched 10,000 more Turks to cross the Hellespont, to his son, Solyman Pacha, the conqueror of Izympe. With this force on the European side of the Bosphorus, Solyman defeated a large body of Sclavonians, whom Paleologus had brought into that country against the emperor. The wishes of Cantacuzene were accomplished, and so were the objects of Orchan and Solyman, the victorious Turks planted their standard in Europe, and there they remained henceforth.

At this period the Genoese, to the great misfortune of the Greeks, were in possession of the suburb of Constantinople called Galata, and the two maritime republics of Genoa and Venice being at war, the Bosphorus became the scene of their contests. The Venetians were allies of the Greek Emperor, whilst the Genoese were amicably disposed towards Orchan.

Orchan, unmindful of his late engagements with Cantacuzene, when an opportunity presented itself of damaging the Venetians, whose fleets had visited some of his seaboard provinces, and taken part with the Christian populations, partially reduced by him, dispatched an auxilliary Turkish force to Galata, to enable the Greeks more effectually to cope with the Venetians. This act, in effect, was an invasion of the territory of the Greek Emperor, and a new example of that predominant vice of the Turkish character—perfidy—which in every phase of the career of this people has been so frequently and signally displayed.

The Christian Emperor of Constantinople made an offer of ten thousand ducats to Solyman, his faithful Turkish ally, to recross the Hellespont, and give him back his European fortress, Izympe, and its surrounding territory. The offer was accepted, and an appointed time fixed for its payment, but before the day came, the doom of Izympe was sealed, with that of various other strongholds, in towns and cities in that part of Thrace. An awful earthquake threw down the walls of the castle recently acquired by the Turks, and all the surrounding habitable places. Instead of being disheartened or discouraged by this great calamity, the Turks saw in it only a visible sign and token of God's favour towards them, and of the Divine wrath against the infidels.

They walked out of the ruins of Izympe, and took the direction of the next Christian fortress (Gallipoli) that was left uninjured by the late earthquake. The walls of the town had suffered, and the inhabitants had been so terror-stricken, that they offered no resistance to the small party of Turks, who suddenly entered, and got possession of a strong city, that was justly considered the key of the Hellespont. A new opportunity arose for playing the old Turkish game of perfidy. Orchan, and his son Solyman, had entered into an engagement with the Greek Emperor that the whole of the Turkish forces, under Solyman, should retire from Izympe, and abandon the European territory; but he only possessed a single fortress when he made this promise; now he had the strong city of Gallipoli, and he had changed his mind.

He took possession of several other places, fortified them, and brought over large bodies of troops, and hordes of Turks and Arabs who followed his armies, with which materials he planted colonies throughout the Thracian Chersonesus. The unfortunate Greek Emperor addressed futile complaints to his Turkish son-in-law, Sultan Orchan, who replied, with all the piety becoming a Mohammedan prince, so renowned for his goodness and zeal for religion: "It was not the force of arms which had opened the Greek cities to his son, but the will of God, which had been manifested in an earthquake." If Oliver Cromwell was conversant with Turkish history, how this passage in it must have taken his fancy! And how the memory of the pious Sultan Orchan must have been venerated by him. The emperor remonstrated, vainly of course, with the Turkish ruler, stating that the question between them was not how the Turks had marched into the cities, but what right they had to retain possession of them.

Orchan played the long game with his Christian father-in-law. He wrote vague letters, wherein he required time to consider the matter in dispute, with due care, and eventually made some proposals for entering into negociations concerning the restoration of the cities. But it was quite evident that his words and intentions were altogether at variance.

At this time Orchan's prosperity might be said to be in its zenith. He had consolidated the power he had received from his predecessor into a great governmental institution, the beginning of a vast empire. He had scarcely anything in this world to desire: his warlike son, Solyman, in all respects worthy of him, was at the height of his renown as a conqueror of the Giaours, a captor of several of their greatest cities and strongholds, in the prime of life, and in the midst of his successes. Suddenly the glory of Orchan is laid in the dust, and the sun of all his hopes is set for ever. Solyman Pacha, while engaged in the sport of falconry, fell from his horse, and was killed on the spot. By his father's orders, his remains were buried on the shore of the Hellespont, to which he had conducted the first

Moslem soldiers, and there opened the first path to the capital of the Roman empire in the East. Orchan, we are told by Knolles, took his son's death much to heart, and within two months of that catastrophe he ended his days, in 1359.

"This Orchan," says old Knolles, "was wise, courteous, and bountiful, more ingenious than his father in devising warlike instruments." . . . In his superstitious religion he was very zealous. He greatly enlarged his kingdom in Asia, and not content to be enclosed with the seas of *Euxinum* and *Hellispontus*, set fast footing in Europe, which some attribute to his son Amurath. He was to the Christians always a most mortal enemy, and so died." *

"Osman's successor," says one of the deepest thinkers of our times, "Orchan, selected a capital, which he ornamented with a mosque, a hospital, a mint, and a college; he introduced professors of the sciences, and, what was as great a departure from Tartar habits, he raised a force of infantry, among his captives (in anticipation of the Janissaries, formed soon after), and he furnished himself with a train of battering engines. More strange still, he gained the Greek emperor's daughter in marriage, a Christian princess; and lastly, he crossed over into Europe under cover of friendship to the court of Constantinople, and possessed himself of Gallipoli, the key of the Hellespont. His successors gained first Roumelia, that is, the country round Constantinople, as far as the Balkin, with Adrianople for a capital: then they successively swept over Moldavia, Servia, Bulgaria, Greece, and the Morea. Then they gained a portion of Hungary; then they took Constantinople, about 400 years ago. Meanwhile, they had extended their empire into Syria, Egypt, and along the coast of Africa. And thus at length they more than half encompassed the Mediterranean, from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Gulf of Venice, and reigned in three quarters of the world.

"Now you may ask me, what were the Christians doing in

* Knolles' History of the Turks, vol. i. p 187.

Europe all this while? Alas! more must be said; it seldom happens that the people go wrong, without the rulers being somewhere in fault, nor is the portion of history to which I am referring an exception. It must be confessed that, at the very time the Turks were making progress, the Christian world was in a more melancholy state than it had ever been either before or since. The sins of nations were accumulating that heavy judgment which fell upon them in the Ottoman conquests and the Reformation. There were great scandals among bishops and priests, as well as heresy and insubordination. As to the Pontiffs who filled the Holy See during that period, I will say no more than this, that it did not please the good Providence of God to raise up for his church such heroic men as St. Leo of the fifth, and St. Gregory of the eleventh century."*

* Lectures on Turkish History.

CHAPTER VIII.

Sultan Amurath the First—Third Ottoman Sovereign.
A.D. 1359—1389.

THE death of Orchan's eldest son, Solyman Pacha, opened a passage for Amurath (in Turkish Murad), Solyman's younger brother, to the Ottoman throne. Amurath was forty years of age when he succeeded his father. He adopted, at the outset of his career, the peculiar policy of his race—of his father Orcan, and his grandfather Othman—of deadly hate and hostility to the Christian name and faith. And once for all I may observe that the distinguishing characteristic of the Turkish race, whether in the individual or the aggregate of its component parts, in the nation, or rather the empire, is abhorrence of Christianity, detestation of the name of Christ, and a profound conviction that paradise is gained by shedding the blood of men who profess to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. That characteristic is not manifested undisguisedly since the destruction of the Janissaries, as it had previously been. That conviction does not *ordinarily* now find expression in overt murderous acts and onslaughts, in violent menaces, and denunciations. It, however, remains unaltered and unalterable in the heart's core of every true believer in the law of Islam.

Amurath was a true believer in the Koran, and a faithful exponent of its principles. He was no sooner seated on the throne than he made preparations to continue the wars carried on by his father, grandfather, and brother, against the

Christian population of the cities, towns, and provinces of the Roman Empire of the east. For nearly a year he was prevented from devoting himself to the particular mission that Providence, in the inscrutable designs of the Divine wisdom, seems to have assigned to Mohammedan power—warfare with the Christian churches and people of the east. Amurath had to make war with a rival Turkish Prince in the heart of Asia Minor, the Emir of Caramania. When that war was over, and his formidable rival defeated, he turned his face towards the great city of the Christians, Constantinople, crossed the Hellespont with a numerous army in 1360, fixing his head-quarters at Gallipoli. He soon gained considerable advantages over the Greeks in various conflicts, assaults on detached fortresses and towns, in Thrace, unprepared for resistance. In 1361 he got possession of the great city of Adrianople, and made that important place the capital of the Turkish empire in Europe.

A little later he ravaged the Greek empire on the confines of Macedonia and Mount Hæmus, captured Phillapolis and Sagræ. He pushed his victorious forces on the frontiers of Wallachia and Moldavia, made wars with Sclavonic tribes of Servia and Bosnia, of independent states, tribes far more formidable than the degenerate race of the Greeks, and their worthless rulers in that age.

He captured also two important towns named Didymayichum and Rhodestum, by an act of perfidy which seems to have been one of the characteristics of his policy, and to have been put in practice by him at Adrianople, as well as at the places above mentioned. For the details of these acts of baseness I must refer my readers to the "Lives of the Ottoman kings and emperor faithfully gathered out of the best histories, both ancient and modern, and digested into continuate history." By Richard Knolles, 1 Ed. fol. Islip. 1620, p. 190.

I place before my readers a single passage from the work above referred to, for the purpose of shewing that in the English works on the Turkish Empire of old writers, we find evidence of sympathy with down-trodden Christianity in the

east, and of hostility against the Mohammedan fanaticism of those times, by which it was persecuted to the death, which we look for in vain in the pages of our modern historical writers. Old Knolles, two centuries and a half ago, commenting on the sufferings of the Christian inhabitants at Thrace, at the hands of the most ferocious of the Mohammedan sultans, says: "Amurath appointed the seat of his royal court at Adrianople, as a place of all others most fit for the further invasion of the Christians, and enlarging of his kingdom in Europe, from whence such a world of mischiefs and woe hath, since that time, overflowed a great part of Christendom, and drowned so many goodly kingdoms in Europe, as that both they, and most part of the rest that yet remain (daily in dread of like destruction), might justly accurse and detest the woful carelessness and degenerate cowardice of the Greeks, were not they themselves, together with the glory of their church and empire swallowed up in the same gulf of calamity and woe, and so become of all others the most miserable."

But what opinion are we to form of the Christian princes and potentates of the west, who so long allowed Mohammedanism to overwhelm the eastern realms of Christendom, with torrent after torrent of murderous fanaticism?

What more legitimate cause for war could there possibly be, *if any war be, indeed, legitimate, just, and necessary*, than action on that terrible doctrine of the Koran, proclaiming war against all unbelievers in it, against Christendom (all Christians being necessarily included in the proscribed category of infidels)? And what action on fanaticism was ever more formidable, more widely extended, or more menacing, not only to Christianity, but to civilisation in Europe, than the sweep of the sword of Mohammedanism in the fourteeenth and fifteenth centuries.

Probably no modern historian hated Christianity with such intensity as Gibbon, or took more pains to hurt it without outraging the conventional usages of authorship, or fought against it with weapons so keen and polished, that did not mangle the form of its fundamental doctrines, but only stabbed at them

through the sides of abuses in discipline, or disorders in ecclesiastical rule and government as the elegant historian of "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." And yet we are told by him, in reference to the disasters of the Greek Empire, the successes of the Turks in Europe, and the dangers to the latter, to be apprehended from the progress of the Ottoman power, in the fourteenth century, that a crusade then undertaken in Europe, for the special purpose of opposing the progress of the enemies of Christendom, and with the destination of its force to be in aid and support of the Christian empire in the east, would have been not only justifiable but expedient.

If it be justifiable and expedient to make war with a nation that will not suffer English opinions to be smuggled into its ports, to carry fire and sword into the heart of an empire with a civilization different to its own, because it will not receive an ambassador in a way that is conformable to European views of diplomatic etiquette, I presume the defence of Christianity and civilisation at a period when both were imperilled by Mohammedanism, might be rested on the ground which Gibbon has taken for them.

Professor Creasy, in his "History of the Ottoman Turks," vol. i. p. 35, in reference to the ravages of the Turks in Servia and Bosnia, in the reign of Amurath, observes:—"The Roman See, once so energetic in raising the early crusades, had disregarded the progress of the new Mohammedan power, so long as the heretical Greeks were the only sufferers beneath its arms. But Hungary, a country that professed spiritual allegiance to the Pope, a branch of Latin Christendom, was now in peril, and Pope Urban the fifth preached up a crusade against the infidel Turks. The King of Hungary, the Princes of Bosnia and Servia, and Wallachia leagued together to drive the Ottomans out of Europe, and their forces marched towards Adrianople, until they crossed the Mazizza, at a point not more than two day's journey from that city."

Popes labour under some difficulties when they are at the tender mercies of English historians. There is no pleasing the

chroniclers and censors of their acts. They are blamed for their too great readiness in promoting crusades; they are censured for not calling on Christian princes to undertake them, and their supineness is ascribed to unworthy motives.

But it is not true that the Greeks were held to be heretics by the Popes, and that no Christians who were trampled down and oppressed by the east, were considered entitled to the sympathies of the Roman Pontiffs, who were not in communion with their church. It is quite clear that when the Turks were carrying war into European countries, bordering on Germany and Italy, it was more incumbent on them to endeavour to avert the danger which was at hand, than that which was remote and foreign.

The allied Christian forces of Hungary and the Danubian territories, that marched against the Turks, and came within two days' journey of the new Turkish capital of Adrianople, allowed themselves to be surprised at night, in the midst of revelry and feasting, defeated, and slaughtered in great numbers.

A desultory warfare, without important results for either Turks or Christians, was kept up for several years. In 1376, the capture of the city of Nissa by the Turks, induced the Prince of Servia to sue to Amurath for peace, which was granted on terms that sealed the fate of Servian independence; an annual tribute of a thousand pounds of silver, and a thousand horse soldiers, for the service of the Ottoman sovereign. The Christian King of Bulgaria, was also compelled to sue for peace, and he had to submit to terms which it is said he preferred to those of pounds of silver and soldiers of horse—he gave his daughter in marriage to the conqueror.

Amurath reposed on his laurels a very long time for a Turkish sovereign. For six years he made no wars; in that interval he organised his civil administration, his armies, his feudal tenures of land, with the obligations of military service; the Timars and Ziamets instituted by his father. He gave a great impetus to the Janissary institution. So great that in the early part of

the reign of his son and successor, Bajazet, their number, we are told by Gibbon, amounted to forty thousand, and from other sources we learn, that at the latter end of the reign of Orchan, the father of Amurath, the originator of this force, they only numbered twelve thousand men. Another Turkish institution, worthy of its origin, a market for the sale of Christian captives, and prisoners of all creeds taken in war by Moslems, was organised by Amurath.

His father, Orchan, when he entered into a treaty of amity with the Greek Emperor, and stipulated for the hand of the Christian daughter of that degenerate prince, exacted another privilege, which Gibbon has recorded and stigmatised as it deserved to be. Orchan demanded and obtained from the Greek Emperor, the right of selling his captives in Constantinople, in a market for slaves; and there, consequently, multitudes of the Emperor's own Christian subjects, men, women, and children, —nay, Gibbon adds, priests and monks—were publicly sold by their Turkish captors.

All the prisoners taken in war, whose lives were spared, were either made tributaries to their Mohammedan conqueror, or sold by him as slaves. The vast numbers of captives made in the early wars of Amurath, suggested to one of his ministers the great advantage to the Treasury of rigorously enforcing the sovereign's claim to a fifth of the living spoil taken in every engagement, for the purpose of sale, or an equivalent in money for the market value of each captive—a source of revenue which had been neglected by the predecessors of Amurath.

But he was "a very politic prince," we are informed, and he evinced his political ability in the way Louis Phillipe distinguished his craftiness, he planned various matrimonial alliances for his sons and other members of his family. He married his eldest son to the daughter of a Turkish emir in Asia Minor, and this marriage gained a new sovereign territory for his Ottoman dynasty. He married his daughter to another Turkish emir, the Prince of Caramania.

He added to his own complement of Turkish wives, a Chris-

tian princess of Constantinople. He permitted his two sons to add likewise to their list of terrestrial houris each a Byzantine princess. In 1380, when Paleologus filled the throne of the Roman empire in the east, the fate of it seemed almost left to the tender mercies of the Turkish sovereign, and his court at Adrianople.

One desperate effort was resolved on in terror, and executed with all the baseness of cowardice and craftiness. The emperor resolved on proceeding to Rome to seek reconciliation with the Latin Church, with the view of obtaining a new crusade against the Mohammedan foe of his emperor, and of Christendom.

And at the same time that he determined on this step, with the view of disarming the anger it was sure to excite in Amurath, this wretched prince sent one of his sons to Adrianople to solicit of Amurath the privilege of being allowed to serve in the ranks of the Turkish army.

This crafty procedure is said to have imposed on Amurath. The young princes of the two courts were then in familiar intercourse. And an event that grew out of that intercourse does not tell very favourably for the morals or the manners of either of them.

Another son of the emperor Paleologus, named Andronicus, was about this time in relations of close friendship with the eldest son of Amurath, named Saoudi. These young men imagined they were badly treated by their fathers, and accordingly entered into a plot, each binding himself to effect a revolution and the downfall of his father's power and authority

The young conspirators took advantage of the absence of Amurath from Adrianople, when one of them, Saoudi, was entrusted by his father with the command of the Turkish forces in Europe, to revolt.

They established their camp not far from Constantinople, and caused great consternation in that capital. Amurath speedily returned from Asia to Adrianople, put the young conspirators to flight, and summoned the Greek emperor to appear before

him to answer for his son's conduct. Paleologus humbly disavowed and strongly reprobated his son's conduct, proffered his services to pursue the culprit princes, and intimated his opinion, if they were taken, that their eyes should be put out. No depth of baseness was too profound for this miserable Greek sovereign to descend to.

The insurgent princes were taken. Saoudi, the son of Amurath, was led before his father, and by that father's orders the son's eyes were put out, and then he was beheaded in his father's presence. Several young Greek nobles, who had been likewise captured, were then led before Amurath, bound together, and by the orders of Amurath, who sat by the bank of the river Marizza, they were taken in batches and thrown into the river, two or three at a time; and as they momentarily struggled, and then sunk, bound as they were together, Amurath smiled with satisfaction at the spectacle. But this satisfaction was not enough for the vengeance of this implacable man, or rather monster of cruelty in human form. The fathers of some of the young insurgents were commanded to kill their sons with their own hands. Two of these unfortunate fathers refused to obey the infernal order, and by his command they were put to death on the spot.

One atrocity more remained to be perpetrated by Amurath—he did not put the son of Paleologus to death. When the execution of his comrades was over, he sent the young prince, Andronicus, in chains to his father, with a message demanding the fulfilment of his obligation, and calling on him to deal with his son as he had done with his. The Christian emperor, in his terror, ordered the eyes of his son to be destroyed, and accordingly they were scalded with burning vinegar; but the operation was so imperfectly performed, that some degree of vision was left the unfortunate youth. He, however, escaped the death awarded to his ill-fated companion, Saoudi, and was imprisoned.

Turkish perfidy was manifested by Amurath signally in his dealings with the Turkish ruler of Caramania, in 1387, to whom

a few years previously he had given his daughter in marriage. Amurath made war on his son-in-law, and a great battle was fought at Iconium, in which engagement the son of Amurath, the Prince Bajazet, greatly distinguished himself by his valour. It must be borne in mind that the battle at Iconium was fought by the ruler of the Turkish people against a descendant of that Seljukian dynasty of Iconium which had given the first asylum to the ancestors of the rulers of the Turkish empire. The astonishing rapidity of the young Bajazet at the battle of Iconium gained for him from his countrymen the designation of *Yilderun*, or "The Lightning." The defeated prince of Caramania owed his life and his possessions to the successful interference of his wife on his behalf with her father. Amurath allowed himself to be appeased by his daughter. His son-in-law was permitted to kiss his hand in token of submission.

In 1388 the Ottoman dominions in Europe comprised the chief part of ancient Thrace and modern Roumelia. As the Turks wrung province after province, and town after town, from the Greek empire, it was their custom to remove the Christian inhabitants, and supply their places as far as possible by Turcoman hordes and Arabs.

The Sclavonic populations of Bulgaria, Bosnia, Hungary, Wallachia, and Moldavia, but chiefly of Servia, who, before the Turks came into Europe, played the most prominent part in the affairs of the Danubian territories and politics, justly alarmed at the continued encroachments of the Turks, leagued together in common defence against the great foe of Christendom. Poland lent its countenance to that league, but Russia was not able to give her aid to it. The Moguls were masters of Russia, and the wrongs of the Sclavonic race were destined to be avenged by her in after ages. The times and the men fit for the crusades had passed away in Western Europe. The principal thrones in Europe, at the close of the fourteenth century, were occupied by degenerate, worthless, weak, or imbecile princes. The power of the popes was the prey of a schism of long endurance, and Catholicism was torn by the rival claims

and pretensions of two aspirants to the papal throne, and conflicting interests and intrigues of two factions, one established in Rome, the other in Avignon.

The allied Sclavonic powers commenced the war against the Turks in Bosnia. There they encountered and defeated an Ottoman army of 20,000 men, utterly destroying 15,000 of the force. Then, like all armed confederacies, divided counsels, jealousies, and intrigues ensued. In 1384 Amurath despatched an army against the Christian foes across the Balkin.

The Turks, at the expiration of five centuries, anxiously look to the same Balkin for a barrier against the Christians of Russia. In the campaign of 1389 they took possession of Shumla, and, strange to aver, it has remained in their possession ever since. Other places of importance were captured by the Turks, Tirnova and Pravadi and Nicopolis; eventually Bulgaria was surrendered to them. In the mean time, Lazarus, the King of Servia, got together a large force, and in the fulness of his pride and confidence of his strength, sent an insolent challenge to Amurath to come to the final decision of a pitched battle with him.

Amurath met his challenger on the 27th of August, 1389, at Kossova, and there he defeated the confederate forces of the Sclavonic nations, in numbers far exceeding those at his command.

Whenever a great crisis occurs in the affairs of the Turks, or any signal crime is about to be committed, we find the Koran consulted, and religion brought to the aid of Moslems against Christian armies, or to the rescue of murderers, for a sanction of sanguinary deeds. The night before the battle of Kossova, when Amurath summoned a council of war, to deliberate on the mode of attacking the enemy, and the time for the engagement, the Grand Vizier took up the Koran, opened it at random, and read aloud the verse—"O, prophet, fight the unbelievers and the hypocrites."

Amurath's "bearer of burdens," again opened the Koran at random, and read aloud the following verse:—

"Verily, a large host is often beaten by a weaker one!"

Heaven having spoken through the Koran, and the words being duly weighed and interpreted, adequate preparations were made for a great pitched battle, that was to be fought the next day, on which the fate of the Turkish Empire depended.

Amurath, at dawn the following morning, saw a sign in the heavens, that God was with the Ottomans in a cloud charged with rain, which no sooner burst than he commenced the battle, stationed in the centre, with the Janissaries and cavalry guard regiment; his eldest son, Prince Bajazet, commanding the right wing, and Prince Yakoub, his other surviving son, commanding the left.

The two armies engaged fiercely, but in excellent order, and kept their ground firmly for several hours. The issue was long doubtful. At one time the Turkish troops on the left wing gave way, but were reinforced by Bajazet, at the head of a formidable band, and, armed with his terrible iron mace, he fought in person, striking down numbers of his opponents, and spreading consternation around him. At this stage of the battle, in the thick of the fight, when the field was covered with heaps of the dead on both sides, a Servian Christian rode into the ranks of Amurath, appearing to be a deserter, and declaring that he had important tidings to communicate to Amurath.

The man was led into the presence of the Turkish sovereign, and kneeling down, when he had approached sufficiently near to have the person of Amurath within his reach, he made a sudden movement, stabbed the Ottoman prince with a dagger, and, while still kneeling down, inflicted a mortal wound on him. The Servian assassin then sprang on his feet, and, with astounding intrepidity and activity, thrice fought his way through his numerous assailants, beat them down, or flung them from him, and even made his way to the spot where he had dismounted from his horse, and while in the act of remounting, he was beset by the Janissaries, overpowered, and hacked to pieces.

The assassin was no ignoble person, he was a Servian nobleman, named Milosch Kabilovitsch.

When we consider the circumstances under which this act was committed, that the Mohammedan troops under Bajazet were gaining signal advantage over the Christians, that with Amurath's death at that critical moment the centre of the Turkish army would have been thrown into consternation, and in all probability easily overpowered, and that victory would have been given to the confederate Christian princes, I, who disbelieve in the utility and doubt the licitness of any war, am yet disposed to consider this act of the Servian noble, Milosch, as one that, perhaps, has never been surpassed in the heroic courage and devotedness displayed in the execution of it.

Amurath, from the moment he was struck by the Servian, was aware that he had received a mortal wound, but he was still able to give orders for the forces in reserve to be brought into the field for a new charge on the enemy. These orders were executed, and they decided the battle in favour of the Turks. Amurath was once more, and for the last time to issue his imperial orders. These orders, which he died in the act of pronouncing, were to have a royal captive, the Servian King, Lazarus, who had been brought into his presence, put to death. Thus died Amurath the First, breathing vengeance, and in the agonies of death, muttering the doom of a Christian foe.

He died in 1389, in his 68th year, having reigned 31 years. His remains were conveyed by his pious son, Bajazet, his successor, to Brusa, and there (says Knolles) were royally interred.

CHAPTER IX.

Sultan Bajazet—Fourth Sovereign of the Ottoman Empire.
1389—1402.

THERE are no historical records of nations that have existed since Christianity was established in Europe, and civilization began to overspread many of the principal countries of antiquity, so uniformly terrible for the atrocities committed in them from first to last, as the annals of the Turkish empire. And yet we find numerous works recently written for the express purpose of making the Turkish religion, the policy and principles of Turkish rule acceptable to European nations, and more especially to the English people. Nay by dint of eulogizing Turkish rule, we have actually worked ourselves into an affectionate interest in its concerns, and a determination to uphold its power, as a force essentially necessary, to the cause of enlightenment and civilization in Europe.

There is something in the fierce enmity and ferocious inhumanity of Amurath the first, that finds admirers in those writers and the readers of their productions. Amurath's stoic philosophy, while he calmly sits on the bank of the river Marizza, and issues orders to have the eyes of his son Saoudi put out, and then that son beheaded, is not without its stern grandeur for some of our Christian advocates of Mohammedanism. The eldest son of Amurath is no sooner seated on the Ottoman throne, than he, too, performs an act of great

energy for which some of the Turkish historians say he was rewarded with that title of Yilderun, or the lightning, to which I have already referred. He stands in the presence of the dead body of his father, and directs his brother Yakoub, who had fought bravely in a late engagement, *to be seized and put to death.* And the Turkish historian, Saededdin, who records this terrible atrocity, well knowing the character of his countrymen and the genius of the Mohammedan religion, finds a sanction for this murder of a well-deserving brother in the holy law of Islam. He tells us that Bajazet put his brother to death, because it is written in the Koran—"Disquiet is worse than putting to death." And, moreover, prudence required the act, because the younger brother of Bajazet, Saoudi, had given a bad example by rebelling against his father, and it was therefore proper, that one who might possibly imitate such an example, should be prevented from so doing by cutting him off.

The pious Mussulman, Saededdin, vindicates Bajazet, moreover, on religious grounds. It was justifiable in him to slay his brother Yakoub, because—"The ruler of the Ottomans is the shadow of God on earth, and the lord and master of all the faithful, and his right it is to rule in conformity with the authority of God, whose example is to be ever followed, he who is the sole ruler, and whom it is impossible to rebel against." Who will be presumptuous enough to deny that the Mohammedan religion is a moral code, and that the followers of the law of Islam are naturally moral, and in all their relations to their families are just, amiable, and kindly disposed.

Bajazet was the first of his race who, about 1392, took the title of Sultan. That borne by his three predecessors was Emir. The caliphs still retain a remnant of their former power in Egypt, but only as religious chiefs of the state. The Mamelukes were the real lords and masters of the country. Bajazet managed, through the Mamelukes, to get their caliph

to sanction his taking the title of Sultan, the dignity of which was superior to that of Bey, assumed by the Mamelukes.

Bajazet was a thorough Turk in his tastes, brutal instincts, and animal propensities. From the time he assumed his new title, he gave himself up for a long period to the gratification of his sensual passions, he ran riot in brutish pleasures. Drunkenness was one of his minor vices. There was no infamy too degrading for this thoroughly brutalized being. Soon and suddenly the divine retribution came on him, and had the punishment of his crimes been less signal, we might have wondered more, that God's judgments had not only overtaken, but overwhelmed him.

A modern historian, Professor Creasy, in eloquent and manly terms, that do honour to him, has referred to the atrocities of this Turkish sovereign :—

"Sufficiently appalling is the institution of the Janissaries, by which the Christian youth was taken from his home, and trained to deadly service against his father's race, and his father's faith. It might seem worthy of having been suggested by the fiend whom Milton describes as—

> "Moloch, horrid king, besmeared in blood,
> Of human sacrifice, and parent's tears.
> . . The strongest, and the fiercest spirit
> That fought in heaven." . . .

"But infinitely more detestable is the Belial spirit that prompted those other ineffable atrocities of Turkish rule."*

Bajazet was wallowing in the mire of his infamous courses, his warlike propensities apparently changed, his martial spirit dulled by sloth and voluptuousness, when the intelligence reached him, that Pope Boniface the eighth had proclaimed a new crusade against him in 1396, and that a large Christian army from the west was then in Hungary, and about to make war against him in his own territories.

It is a very singular characteristic of the Turkish power, that

* Professor Creasy's History of the Roman Turks, vol. i. p. 54.

at various periods when the turpitude of its government, the weakness of its armies, the inefficiency of the Ottoman rulers or sovereigns, seemed to have brought the empire to the very brink of ruin, its fall has been invariably retrieved in some way or another that could not have been foreseen, or reasonably expected. And such retrievals always appear to have taken place at times when the inherent vices of Turkish rule and rulers, were most flagrant and obvious.

Sigismund, the King of Hungary, was the prime mover in the efforts made in France and Italy to get up this crusade, and there certainly never was a period when Hungary, and, indeed, Christendom, was in more peril from the Mohammedans, than from the date of the fatal battle of Kossova, in 1389, to the year 1396. The new crusaders comprised a force of men of arms of France and Burgundy, youthful adventurers of an enterprising spirit, more remarkable for chivalrous aspirations, than for discipline and subordination as soldiers. The son of the Duke of Burgundy, the Count of Nevers, commanded this body, whose proclaimed objects were to save Hungary, and to deliver the Holy Land from the infidels.

The chief commanders, under the Count de Nevers, were the cousins of the French King, James de Bourbon, Henry de Bar, and Phillipe de Bar, and the Count de la Manche. Many other gallant knights, and French seigneurs joined the crusaders, among them Sir Guy de la Tremouille (one of the ancestors of Lord Derby, in the maternal line), the Constable of France, and Prince of the Blood, Philippe of Artois, Sir John de Vienne Bourcault, Marshal of France, the Seigneur de Courcy, Sir Reginald de Royes, the Seigneur de St. Pol, the Seigneur de Montmorel, and Seigneur de Sampe, and many more brave knights, puissant lords, and gallant youths of noble houses—"The very flower of the French chivalry."

Alas, the power to which the Ottoman Empire owed its origin and its progress, for the chastisement of Christendom, was destined still to be its protection, and the scourge of European princes. The flower of the French chivalry was doomed

to perish miserably, the majority of its gallant knights and its young princes to be butchered in cold blood by the enemies of their faith and its standard, the cross.

The French and Burgundian Crusaders were joined in Germany by the Grand Prince of the Teutonic Order, Count Hohenzollern, and the Grand Master of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, Phillibert de Naillac, at the head of a strong body of the Knights of his Order. In the ranks of the crusaders there were likewise a company of Bavarian men-at-arms, with many knights, commanded by the Elector Palatine, and a German nobleman, the Count of Munspelgarde, and likewise a band representing the Styrian chivalry, commanded by Herman, Count de Lilly.

This magnificent array of European military skill and chivalry was considered by the King of Hungary, as an auxiliary force of greater power and importance than perhaps their numbers justified. When they reached the Danube, and were prepared to commence hostilities against the Turks, in 1396, they numbered only from ten to twelve thousand. The chronicler of this crusade speaks of the great courage and confidence of its members. They were so confident in their own prowess, that they boasted—"If the sky were to fall, they would uphold it on the point of their lances."

The flower of the chivalry of Frankistan vaunted a little too much, it was not the falling heavens these gallant knights had to sustain, but the falling blows of the Turkish scymitar they had to provide against, and unfortunately were unable to withstand. Sigismund of Hungary had left nothing undone to gather elements of strength round his cause, and that of Christendom. He had persuaded the Prince, or Vaivode of Wallachia to break his engagements with the Turkish enemy of their common faith, the Sultan Bajazet, though only a short time previously he had entered into a treaty of peace and amity with the Sultan, and became a vassal and a tributary of Bajazet. The crusaders marched on the Danube by two routes—by Wallachian and Servian territories.

The first Turkish town and fortress that the King of Hungary attacked, was Widden, which he captured. The next place that surrendered to him was Orsova. Kaco was next taken by assault, and there the proposition was demonstrated that in war, human beings of all creeds cease to be influenced by religious principles and considerations, that the prince of the power of the air is the deity who prevails and predominates there.

At Raco, the garrison of Mohammedans, though taken by assault, laid down their arms, and asked for quarter; but they asked their Christian captors in vain for mercy; they were all put to the sword. After this great crime against their religion, the Christians, puffed up with pride and confidence, attacked Nicopolis. Bajazet had not yet been seen or heard of by the Christians, but during the assault the Turkish Sultan had crossed the Bosphorus, and was within a few miles of their camp, with a powerful and well-disciplined army, while the flower of the chivalry of Frankistan, were utterly regardless of any opposition that could be brought to bear against it.

On the 24th of September, 1396, the Count de Nevers, and the gallant French knights were carousing at a banquet, when alarming tidings were brought to the revellers that a great army of Turks, with the sultan at their head, was close at hand. Then there was consternation among the young Palladins of France, or rather, confusion. The King of Hungary appears to have been prepared for the emergency. He took his measures promptly and efficiently for action, and fruitlessly endeavoured to persuade the Count de Nevers and his French knights to take the course, which his full experience of the tactics of the Turkish army, justified him in suggesting. The Count and his French knights, flushed with the pleasures of the table, and the pride which was a portion of their nationality, disdained to receive, and refused to follow any suggestions of an Hungarian Prince. In utter disregard of the advice of the latter, they exposed their line and expended their strength in making an attack on some irregular Turkish troops, put forward by Bajazet at the commencement of the action, that could be attended

with no important result, or permanent advantage. They took some Turkish prisoners, and they massacred them, and the high pressure vapour of their valour found a valve, but not of safety for this violent outburst of bigoted ferocity.

They redeemed, however, their folly and their crime by subsequent acts of valour that threatened the Turkish army with destruction, till the wily sultan, who handled his army with consummate military skill, suddenly appeared at the head of an effective reserve force of fresh troops, and utterly routed, not only the French troops, but the whole army of crusaders. The King of Hungary's forces were nearly annihilated. The Bavarian and Styrian auxiliaries suffered no less severely, and those of the flower of the French chivalry, were either slain in the battle, or captured and reserved, with a few exceptions, for a worse fate at the hands of their barbarous enemies. Bajazet, after the battle, rode over the field, and his *religious feelings* were pained at finding so many true believers lying dead on the plain of Nicopolis.

This monster is reported by Turkish historians to have said: "This has been a cruel battle for our people; the Christians have defended themselves desperately; but I will have this slaughter revenged on those who are our prisoners."

Bajazet let the sun go down on his wrath, in order that it might rise on a long day for the indulgence of his revenge; and the following morning he arose, performed his prayers and ablutions, proclaimed there was no God but one God, of whom Mohammed was the prophet, and then set to a work of blood, that can only be paralleled by other works of savagery, perpetrated by Turks within the last 500 years.

The sacred emblem of the crescent, which Bajazet had adopted for the device of Turkish power and pre-eminence, was made the figure in which the Turkish army was formed on that dreadful day of Ottoman retribution; he, the supreme sovereign and arbiter of the destinies of Christian nations, was seated in the centre. Christian prisoners, the remnant of the flower of the chivalry of Frankistan, to the number of ten thousand were

led before him, with their hands tied behind their backs and with halters round their necks. Bajazet singled out the Count of Nevers, gave him his life, and desired him to select twenty-four of his fellow-prisoners, of the Christian nobles, whose lives he also spared.

He then gave a signal, which was well understood, and promptly obeyed. The rest of the prisoners, with a few exceptions, were immediately led in detachments before the Sultan's tent, where Bajazet stood at the entrance with the Count of Nevers and his companions, whose lives had been spared, and were slaughtered there; those who were cut down by the appointed executioners, with the sword, were battered to death by the maces of the Janissaries.

Froissart has detailed the horrors of this Turkish massacre, but the account of it that is most valuable and reliable, we are told by Von Hammer, has been left by a young German soldier, Schildberger, who was the squire of a Bavarian knight, who fell in the battle of Nicopolis, and being taken prisoner, remained in Turkish slavery thirty-four years, and then contrived to gain his freedom, and return to his own land.

The massacre of the Christians endured from daybreak till four o'clock in the afternoon, the executioners' strength failed, and but for the strong arms, and sinewy frames, and the heavy iron maces of the Janissaries, the carnage could not have been continued. But Bajazet's mind never changed, his heart never sickened at the horrors that were perpetrated by his command. Towards evening some of his grandees ventured to come between the monster and the victims of his vengeance; and they besought their master to cease the killing of the captives, and to make slaves of the survivors. Cupidity, or the fear of discontenting his followers, caused Bajazet to comply with this entreaty. He chose the fifth part of the surviving captives for his imperial share of the human spoil, and the rest were given up to those who had lawful claims on them as their captives.

The Count of Nevers and his twenty-four companions in misfortunes were carried to Brusa, and the year following the

ransom money fixed on having arrived, they were liberated, but not before they were entertained by the Sultan at a banquet of barbaric magnificence and field sports, in which there were seven thousand falcons, and as many huntsmen of the Sultan's own sporting establishment to be seen.

After the battle of Nicopolis, Bajazet sent presents of Christian captives to the principal Mohammedan princes in Europe and Asia. He employed some of his generals in devastating Styria and the southern provinces of Hungary; and he led an army into Greece with which he marched through Thessaly, and wherever he came conquered almost without the pleasure of fighting, got possession of Bæotia, Locris, Phocis, and many towns and strongholds of the Greeks. He despatched an army across the Isthmus of Corinth, that made a conquest of the whole of Peleponesus. Thirty thousand of the Christian inhabitants were torn from their country, and transported into Asia, and barbarous Turkish hordes were planted in their stead in different regions of Greece.

Bajazet followed up the victory of Kossova by new efforts against the confederate forces of the Christians. The new king of Servia, Stephen Lasarevich, abandoned the confederates, entered into a treaty with Bajazet, in virtue of which Servia became a vassal state of the Turkish Sultan, engaged himself to pay a considerable tribute; and lastly gave his Christian sister to the Sultan, and became a faithful ally of his brother-in-law.

In 1390 Bajazet was again at war with several European provinces and territories, with Hungary, Bosnia, Wallachia, and with the Greek empire. The prince of Wallachia submitted in 1391, and his territory ever since has remained a vassal province of the Ottoman empire. In 1392 the Hungarian sovereign, Sigismund, obtained some success in Bulgaria, but was eventually routed, and driven back into his own country.

In 1392 the Prince of Caramania rose against the Ottomans in Asia, and at first was successful; but when Bajazet came in great force against him in Persia, the prince was taken prisoner

committed to the charge of Bajazet's viceroy, and put to death by him, without the orders of the Sultan. Bajazet consoled himself with the reflection that the death of a Prince was not so bad as the loss of a province, which sagacious maxim became a Turkish canon of the *haute politique.*

Bajazet was ever lusting after new territory. He had a passion for adding province after province to his dominions. He conquered Caramania, and vast regions of the south of Asia Minor. Then he made razees to the east and north, and annexed Sivas, Amassia, Kaslemoune, and the surrounding regions, to his dominions.

The last conquest of the great Turkish scourge of God in those parts of Christendom, was that of Athens in 1397.

Then Bajazet for a while reposed from his labour of destruction. But another scourge of the human race in the heart of Tartary was then planning the downfall of the Turkish Sultan.

Bajazet, in 1402 A.D., was at the pinnacle of greatness. Nothing he could do, in his own idea, could add to his renown; nothing, he imagined, that man could do could take from it. He had menaced Constantinople with a siege, and had been bought of by the cession of a Christian church in the capital itself, to be converted into a mosque, and an obligation of the emperor to pay an annual tribute of 10,000 ducats.

A little later, the imperious Sultan in the plenitude of his power and his insolence, sent a message to Constantinople to the emperor, asserting his supreme right to the sovereignty, and demanding the surrender of the crown which represented it, on pain of extermination of all the inhabitants of the city. The demand of the ferocious Sultan, intoxicated with prosperity and puffed up with pride and confidence, was rejected with becoming spirit, and Bajazet was preparing to put his threats against Constantinople and its Christian people, into execution when one of those small clouds, which prognosticate state tempests, in some adjacent territory, but which afford no warning

to the regions which are doomed to be swept by them was seen gathering in the east.

Timour, the Tartar, or *Timourlenk*, as he was named by his people. Timour, the lame, which we have contrived to corrupt into Tamerlane, or Tamberlain, was a native of Sogdiana, of a Mogul race, a worthy, and on the mother's side, a direct descendant of Zinghis Khan. Having overrun a great portion of the globe, he resolved to overthrow that great engine of destruction, the Turkish empire, and to conquer the hitherto invincible Sultan, Bajazet, the terror of Christendom, and of all Christian nations in the east. When Timour established the seat of his Mongol empire in Samarcand, he aspired to universal dominion, and assumed a variety of titles indicative of his claim to qualities which fitted him for the attainment of his grand project. In addition to his title of Khan of Zagatai, he added those of *Guryan*, *Sahet Kiwan*, and *Zehargyr*, anglice "the Great Wolf," "the Lord of the Age," "the Conqueror of the World."

Professor Creasy, in reference to the extent of the power, the number of the conquests, the multitude of nations, he ruled over, observes:

"The career of Timour, as a conqueror, is unparalleled in history; for neither Cyrus, nor Alexander, nor Cæsar, nor Attila, nor Zinghis Khan, nor Charlemagne, nor Napoleon, ever won by the sword so large a portion of the globe, or ruled over so many myriads of subjugated fellow-creatures."*

"Elated with his successes, Bajazat (says Dr. Newnham) put no bounds to his pride and ambition. He vaunted that he would subdue, not Hungary only, but Germany and Italy besides; and that he would feed his horses with a bushel of oats on the altar of St. Peter's at Rome. . . The Disposer of all things sent against him the fierce Timour, of whom so much has been said. One would have thought the two

* Professor Creasy's History of the Turks, vol. i. p. 72.

conquerors could not possibiy come into collision,—Timour, the Lord of Persia, Khorassan, Sogdiana, and Hindostan, and Bajazet, the Sultan of Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece. They were both Mohammedans; they might have turned their backs on each other, if they were jealous of each other, and might have divided the world between them. Bajazet might have gone forward towards Germany and Italy, and Timour might have stretched his conquests into China.

"But ambition is the spirit of envy as well as of cupidity; neither of them could brook a rival greatness. Timour was on the Ganges, and Bajazet was besieging Constantinople, when they interchanged the words of hatred and defiance. Timour called Bajazet a pismire, whom he would crush with his elephants; and Bajazet retaliated with a worse insult on Timour, by promising he would capture his retinue of wives. The foes met at Angora in Asia Minor; Bajazet was defeated and captured in battle, and Timour secured him in an iron-barred apartment or cage, which, according to Tartar custom, was on wheels, and he carried him about, as some wild beast, on his march through Asia. Can imagination invent a more intolerable punishment upon pride? Is it not wonderful that the victim of it was able to live as many as nine months under such a visitation?"

Attila was a pagan. Zinghis Khan was one also, but with some glimmerings of Christianity in his heathenism. Timour was a zealous Mussulman, who felt some migivings about his past course towards the end of his life; and the groans and shrieks of the dying and the captured in the sack of Aleppo awoke for awhile the stern monitor within him. He protested to the cadhi, we are told by Gibbon, his innocence of the blood which he had shed. "You see me here," he said, "a poor, lame, decrepit mortal; yet by my arm it has pleased the Almighty to subdue the kingdoms of Iran, Touran, and Hindostan. I am not a man of blood; I call God to witness, that never, in all my wars, have I been the aggressor, but that my

enemies have ever been the authors of the calamities which have come upon them."*

Timour, after a brief repose of two months, was awakened to the cares of government and war. The standard was unfurled for the invasion of China; the emirs made a report of an army of 200,000 men, the select and veteran soldiers of Iran and Touran, and all the necessary munitions of war, provisions, and means of conveyance for the intended expedition to Pekin.

"Neither age, nor the severity of winter, could retard the impatience of Timour; he mounted on horseback, passed the Sihun (or Jaxartes), on the ice, marched three hundred miles from his capital, and pitched his last camp at Otrar, where he was expected by the angel of death. Fatigue, and the indiscreet use of iced water, accelerated the progress of his fever; and the conqueror of Asia expired in the seventieth year of his age; his designs were lost, his armies were disbanded, and China was saved.

"But the wonderful course of human affairs rolled on. Timour's death was followed at no long interval by the rise of John Basilowich in Russia, who succeeded in throwing off the Mogul yoke, and laid the foundation for the present mighty empire. The Tartar sovereignty passed from Samarcand to Moscow."†

Bajazet's rage for annexing kingdoms, and his passion for robbery proved ruinous to him, as eventually it must to every *conquistador*, who encumbers his power with curses not loud but deep, of wronged proprietors of the soil. The fortified city of Sivas, the ancient Sebaste, taken only a few years previously,

* When Timour's advancing years and infirmities were admonishing him of eternity, he reposed from the cares of government and the fatigues of war for a few years. But this brief interval was devoted to festivities, and pageantries of marvellous splendour and ostentation. He determined on the celebration of the marriages of six of his grandsons, in which the pomp of the ancient caliphs was revived. Timour's thoughts were taking a serious turn at this period, so the celebration of these marriages, we are told by an English historian, was esteemed an act of religion, as well as of paternal tenderness. But the religious and tender mood were not of long continuance.

† Lectures on Turkey, &c.—1853.

was the first place in the Ottoman Empire attacked by Timour. Constantinople, which was about to be besieged at that period, owed its safety to the panic occasioned by this intelligence. Bajazet's favourite son, Ertogrul, and the bravest of his children, was dispatched to Sivas, to succour and defend that stronghold. But all the efforts of Ertogrul to aid the garrison, chiefly composed of Armenian Christians, to the number of four thousand, was in vain, Sivas was taken by Timour, and Ertogrul, the brave son of Bajazet, and the entire garrison were put to death by Timour, and savagely maltreated by him. The four thousand Christian warriors of Armenia that composed the garrison were led forth and buried alive before the walls, by his orders. Before being cast into the pits prepared for them, their heads were tied down between their legs, by thongs fastened round their necks, so as to bring their faces backward, and in this agonising posture they were cast into the pits, and left uncovered for some hours, with the view of prolonging their dreadful sufferings. Prince Ertogrul and the Moslems of the garrison were put to death by the sword.

Bajazet, for the first time in his life, was sensibly affected by the intelligence of the loss of his favourite son, and a place of great importance, like that of Livas.

Timour had vowed the subjugation of the Ottoman Empire, but he could afford to wait two years for a convenient time to carry his purpose into effect. In the spring of 1402, Timour marched with an immense army of those Tartar hordes, whose almost countless multitudes at former periods used to gather round Zinghis Khan, or flock to the standard of Attila. That army of Tartars was estimated at the astounding number of 700,000 men, whilst all the force that Bajazet could muster, of all sorts of troops, regular and irregular, did not exceed 120,000, but when brought into the field, the number of effective Turkish troops did not exceed 100,000 men.

Timour, notwithstanding his overwhelming superiority of numbers, put in practice all his subtle policy of secret espionage and of corruption on a grand scale, the employment of mercenary

agents, chiefly of traitors, who had been bought over, to corrupt the troops of Bajazet, and to bribe the commanders as countrymen of Timour, by descent, or settlement, or by both, to abandon the service of the sultan, and fly to the arm of their Tartar countryman, Timour.

The emissaries of Timour were remarkably successful. The Turkish Sultan's excessive rigour, and his parsimonious spirit caused people to fall off in vast numbers from his service, while his unbounded arrogance disgusted the principal part of his grandees. Timour sedulously avoided coming to a general engagement with his opponent's forces in the vicinity of the seat of his dominions. He manœuvred his immense masses with consummate skill, and managed to collect them on the plain of, and in the city of Angora. There he took his stand, and waited to be attacked, on the favourable ground he had selected for a pitched battle.

In these circumstances, Bajazet, evidently infatuated by delusive hopes of success, or more probably stricken by temporary insanity, encamped his troops to the north of Timour's army in its entrenched position; and, as if to shew how light he made of the 700,000 Tartars of his adversary's army, he gave orders for the whole force, then reduced to about 100,000 men, to move to the adjoining high grounds on a grand hunting expedition, and to encircle a vast space enclosing several miles of ground in extent, so as to drive the game where the sultan and his staff were located. The district thus occupied by the army of Bajazet was destitute of water. There were neither springs, streams, lakes, nor rivers in any portion of it, and there five thousand of Bajazet's army perished of thirst and fatigue, making sport for their crack-brained lord and master.

Bajazet now would have avoided an engagement, in the disadvantageous position he found himself inveigled by his wily adversary. But either retreat was impossible, or too disgraceful in the eyes of a conqueror heretofore never worsted in the field; so Bajazet disposed his army for battle on the 20th of July, 1402, when one of the most terrible conflicts that ever took

place commenced. All the superiority in order, discipline, military skill, and enthusiasm was on the side of Timour's army, with the exception of Bajazet's corps of janissaries, which served as a body guard, and a large body of Christian Servian auxiliaries under King Lazarewith. From morning to night the battle continued with unmistakeable evidences in a great many thousands of dead bodies of slaughtered Turks on the field of battle, of advantages for Timour and his army, and of discomfiture for the forces of the Turkish Sultan. At night-fall, finding the remnant of his faithful janissaries incapable of further effort in his defence or their own, he attempted to escape from the field of battle on horseback, but was observed by Timour's watchful staff, and pursued. A stumble of his horse decided his destiny: he fell, and a Tartar prince, named Mahmoud Khan of Jagelar, made the sultan of the Ottoman empire his prisoner. Of five sons, to whom Bajazet assigned commands in his army that morning, one, the Prince Musa, was taken prisoner in the engagement; another Mustapha disappeared, and never more having been heard of, it was supposed he was slain. His eldest, Solyman, escaped to the shores of the Bosphorus; another, Prince Mohammed, contrived to make his way to Amassia, and a favourite son Ifsa fled to Caramania. The three surviving sons of the captive sultan, with the fourth, Musa, who was liberated after his father's death, spent the remainder of their lives, like the brothers of Cadmus, in deadly strife, waging incessant wars, or plotting innumerable plans of secret treachery or of open vengeance against each other.

The state of apparent ruin of the Ottoman power in Europe and Asia continued from 1402 to 1413. In this interval Solyman was slain by his own troops. Musa was slain likewise by his own troops, the first blow being struck by the aga of the janissaries. Issa disappeared in one of the contests between Solyman and Mohammed. At length Mohammed, after Musa's death, being the sole surviving son of Bajazet, the war of succession ceased, and Sultan Mohammed the First (one of the best of his race) ascended the throne of the Ottoman empire,

and from the beginning to the end of his career as a Turkish sovereign, he was noted for his justice and humanity, and for the fidelity of his engagements to the Byzantine empire.

It is not by any means so marvellous or rare as it appears to be, that fathers who are the worst of men have sometimes sons in many instances signally good, amiable, and virtuous.

And now we come to a curious passage in Turkish history, the treatment which Bajazet received at the hands of Timour, his captor. The fact of the captive sultan being barbarously used by Timour admits of no doubt. The fact of his being conveyed from place to place by Timour in a wooden case or box, the front of which was secured with iron bars, is no less certain. But, strange to say, some modern historians, in their anxiety to uphold the dignity of the fallen Sultan, deny that there is any foundation whatsoever for the story of Bajazet being carried about in an iron cage by the Tartar king, and yet they feel obliged to acknowledge that "when the Mongol army (says Professor Creasy) moved from place to place, he took his captive with him; but in order to avoid the hateful sight of his enemies, Bajazet travelled in a covered litter, with iron lattice work."*

Professor Creasy would have it believed that Bajazet voluntarily adopted the iron lattice-work to his covered litter, in order to avoid the sight of his enemies; and yet the Professor tells us previously that: "Bajazet was at first treated by Timour with respect and kindness, but an ineffectual attempt to escape incensed the conqueror, and increased the rigour of the Sultan's captivity. Thenceforth Bajazet was strictly watched by a numerous guard, and was placed in fetters every night."†

Old Knowles, in his account of the capture of Bajazet, says that "when the Sultan was brought into the presence of Tamerlane, as a prisoner, though courteously entertained by the conqueror, he never showed any sign of submission at all, but, according to his proud nature, forgetful of his present state,

* History of the Ottoman Turks, vol. i. p. 79. † Ibid, p. 79.

answered presumptuously any question demanded of him. Wherewith Tamerlane reminded him that his life was in his (Tamerlane's) power, to take it if he thought proper. Whereupon Bajazet answered no more, but "do it; for that loss would be his great happiness." Tamerlane afterwards demanded of him many things which he answered.

And then Tamerlane said to him: "And what wouldest thou have done with me, if it had been my fortune to have fallen into thy hands as thou art now in mine?"

Bajazet replied, "I would have enclosed thee in a cage of iron, and so in triumph have carried thee up and down my kingdom."

"Even so," said Tamarlane, "shalt thou be served."

And so, causing him (Bajazet) to be taken out of his presence, turning unto his followers, he said: "Behold a proud and cruel man; he deserves to be chastised accordingly, and to be made an example unto all the proud and cruel of the world, of the just wrath of God against him."

* * * "Behold Bajazet (continued Knowles), the terror of the world, and, as he thought, superior in fortune, in an instant, with all his state, in one battle overthrown and cast down into the bottom of misery and despair, and that, too, at the time he least expected (a reverse), even in the midst of his greatest strength. It was three days, as they report, before he could be pacified, but, as a desperate man, still seeking after death, and calling for it. Neither did Tamerlane, after he had spoken with him once, at all afterwards courteously use him; but, as of a proud man, caused small account to be made of him. And to manifest that he knew how to punish the haughty, he made him to be shackled in fetters and chains of gold, and so to be shut up in an iron cage made like a grate, in such sort that he might every side be seen, and carried him up and down as he passed through Asia, to be of his own people scorned and derided."*

* Knowles' Lives of the Ottoman Kings and Emperor's, &c., Ed. fol. London, 1620.

Nothing can be more unsatisfactory than Von Hammer's mode of dealing with this subject, in the second volume of his "Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman Traduit de l'Ottoman, par M. Neller, vol. viii." He sets out with refuting the story of the iron cage as utterly unfounded, and yet he cites the accounts of cotemporary writers, which can leave no possible doubt on the mind of any rational inquirer, that Bajazet, after an unsuccessful attempt to escape, was treated with excessive rigour, constantly chained at night; and when taken about from place to place by his proud captor, as an exhibition that redounded to his glory, that he was conveyed in a case, or box, or enclosed litter, fastened in front with bars of iron. The Count Bouricault, a cotemporary, and one of the crusaders taken prisoners by Bajazet, in referring in his memoirs to the treatment Bajazet received, says: "Bajazet died in horrible sufferings."

Of three Byzantine historians, who give details of the captivity of the sultan, two—Ducas and Chalcondyle—make mention of the chains with which he was loaded; and Ducas says, they were only used at night. Phranzes says expressly he was carried about in an iron cage. The Syrian Arabshah gives the same account. But Von Hammer's denial of any foundation for the story of the iron cage is clearly shown to be in contradiction with his own statement of the fact at page 97, that there was an extreme severity practiced in the custody of Bajazet, after his attempt to escape, that from that time he was chained during the night.

"This extreme severity (he observes), and a false interpretation of the Turkish word *Kafe*, which signified a cage and also a chamber, or a grilled litter, have given origin to the story of the iron cage, which all the European historians have repeated on the authority of the Byzantine writer, Phranzes and the Syrian Arabshah."*

By Von Hammer's own admission, there must have been a

* Von Hammer, Tom. i. p. 97.

Kafe used for conveying the captive sultan from place to place; and whether it was a cage, a chamber, or an enclosed litter, is a matter of no importance whatsoever, what is of importance is, that this Kafe was "grilled," as Von Hammer terms it, or rather, as I think may be fairly inferred from the several accounts, iron barred, and that this Kafe was a wooden case, or chest, thus closed in front, such as are still used for the conveyance of female slaves of great estimation and value, slung between two camels, or horses, I have very little doubt.

Bajazet did not long survive the ignominious treatment he received at the hands of Timour, the refined cruelty of carrying him about caged like a wild beast, or secured in a wooden box with iron bars, or grills, for exhibition on a triumphant progress, as a spectacle to illustrate a capture or a conquest, and a specimen of a captive sultan suffered to live to be shown people. He died in March, 1403, eight months after the battle of Angora. His son Musa was then set free, and allowed to convey the remains of his father to Brusa for interment. Timour went to his great account on his march to China, with the intention of conquering that region. He died at Obra, the 1st February, 1805.

"All earthly power (says Dr. Newman) has an end; it rises to fall, it grows to die; and the depth of its humiliation issues out of the pride of its lifting up."

On the close of the career of Timour, I have only one remark to make.

Not even the deadly influences of the Mohammedan religion could extinguish in the old Tartar warrior's bosom the remorse engendered by the terrible effusion of human blood in those wars which he Timour had waged in the name of, and in accordance with, the fundamental principle of the Mohammedan religion. The unfortunate old man in his extremity, would have persuaded his friends that his wars had always been just and necessary; but for examples of this kind of infatuation we need not go to Tartary, nor return to the dark ages. He tried to

deceive himself, and perhaps succeeded in persuading himself that he was not a man of blood; and in his terrible audacity he ventured to believe it was even possible to deceive God, and in his exceeding great wickedness, he called on the Deity to witness that he was not the author of the calamities of those who had been smitten by his sword—that his enemies were the authors of the calamities which had fallen on them at his hands.

A modern historian has summed up in a few emphatic words the titles of Timour to earthly honour, and to eternal felicity.

"Timour died in February 1405, at the age of seventy-one, having reigned thirty-one years, *during which he shed more blood, and caused more misery than any other human being that ever was born in this world.*"

Mighty conquerors, and makers of wars great and little! emulate the heroic acts of this Tartar murderer, on a grand scale! Remember the renown he has acquired by them! Timour has surpassed all his predecessors and his followers in the amount of glories of carnage and rapine, without bounds or measure, stint or scruple. What a thing is it for man born of woman to boast of! That he has shed more blood and caused more misery than any other human being that ever was born in this world, which historians deal with.

I have amplified a thought, and extended the expression of it, which I found in a treatise entitled "De Infelicitate Principium." Poggius lived long enough in courts, and in commerce with men of great genius and glory in various pursuits, to know it was not all gold that glittered in those commodities of exalted imagination, extravagant undertakings, and exorbitant renown.

There is an imperceptible misery, inseparable from the condition of human nature; it abides in the conviction that we scarcely ever can arrive at anything great; the origin of which is not discovered in some place, or in combination with other elements, which humiliate the discover. The greater part of those persons who have been signally and suddenly suc-

cessful in any pursuit whatsoever, have had some disturbance in their imagination. The brilliant flashes of eloquence, the bold strokes of the pencil of art, Poggins thinks, are sorts of crisis of enthusiasm, each of which is an excess of nervous excitation, that disturbs, stimulates unduly the mental energies, and is followed by reaction, that exhausts and wears out the apparatus of thought and life prematurely. Heroism itself is an exaltation of ideas, a dominion of them over the organs of sense, the perception of danger, the passion of fear, that borders on the domain of insanity. The majority of great conquerors of world-wide renown, are of the category of phrensied, turbulent, tempestuously-minded persons, to which Orestes and Atreus belonged. Their fury was their genius, and there was nothing of a divine origin in it.

CHAPTER X.

The Doom and Destiny of the Christian Rajahs of the Turkish Empire, and consequences of the Capture of Constaninople.—A.D. 1453.

FROM the time of the death of Bajazet in 1403, to the accession of Selim the third in 1789, there is a period of 386 years. In this interval there have been twenty-four sultans. Instead of detailed accounts of their reigns, such as I have given of the four first Ottoman sovereigns, and shall give of the four last Sultans, I will deal generally with the decisive occurrences of that intermediate period, and such of the institutions of the Turkish Empire as originated in that interval, and specially serve to illustrate the subject of this work.

I have pointed out at some length in a preceding chapter, devoted to the Koran, the bearing of the law of Islam on the condition of captives taken in war, who do not come within the category of idolators, especially intended to include the Arabs in "the state of ignorance," who adhered to their old pagan rites and doctrines. Two formulas of capitulation, those of the people of Jerusalem to the caliph Omar, and of the inhabitants of Constantinople to the Sultan Mohammed the second, served generally as models for the terms entered into by the Mohammedan captors of all Christian towns and cities, taken by or surrendered to them. It is needless to observe that where much loss was sustained by the Turks in a siege, or extraordinary valour was exhibited by the Christians in de-

fence of any besieged places, the formulas of the capitulations of the times of the caliph Omar, and Sultan Mohammed the second, were of no use. The Christians were usually butchered in cold blood, for one, two, or three days, after the Turks occupation of a recently captured town or city.

In the chapter on the caliphate, I have given an account of the terms accorded to the Christians by the Caliph Omar. These terms served the Turkish captor of Constantinople for the basis of his terms with the Pabunress of that city. But those who extol the moderation of those terms, seem to forget the antecedent carnage and butchery of the unfortunate vanquished Christians of Constantinople, at the hands of the Turkish conquerors.

They will find those terrible Ottoman antecedents set forth in the pages of Gibbon, coldly indeed and with as little sympathy for human sufferings, as could be decently manifested for unfortunate human beings, who believed in Christ, and were slaughtered by thousands by those who were inimical to Christianity. That man of wonderful ability, and not only ability, but elegance of taste in style and composition, as well as of profound research and singular accuracy in the statement of its results, the infidel Gibbon, narrates the capture of Constantinople, and the horrors of it, with all the composure and calmness of philosophical indifference, to which Christianity is not in the smallest degree more dear or less odious than Mohammedanism.

There is a remarkable passage in M. Ubicini's latest published volume, "Lettres sur la Turquie," well deserving attention for an inconsistency which many other writers on Turkey have fallen into:—"Much has been said of the proselytising spirit of the Turks, though, in fact nothing is more contrary to their principles, nor more at variance with their practice. Unlike the Christian, the Mussulman looks not upon the human race as one vast brotherhood, to which he himself belongs. He offers no prayers for the conversion of the infidel, and he suffers no sorrow from the reflection that millions of his fellow-crea-

tures are in danger of being cut off from the eternal happiness which God has promised to the elect. He would not have lighted the fires of the Inquisition, neither would he traverse deserts nor climb mountains like the Christian missionary, in order to win souls for heaven, and procure for men whom he never saw, the consolations of the true faith, and the blessed hopes of another world. Wherefore should he? He believes that the number of the elect and the condemned have been fixed by God himself from all eternity; and, moreover, is it not written in the Holy Book that 'He who saith there is but one God shall enter into Paradise?' "

Here we have an assertion, and one, strange to say, of general acceptance, that nothing is more contrary to the principles, or more at variance with the practice of the Turks, than a proselytising spirit. If there be one doctrine enunciated in the Koran, that may be truly designated a fundamental principle of the law of Islam, it is the doctrine of proselytism, and the practical enforcement of it. The Koran abounds with passages wherein the true believers are told, when they go out to fight with the infidels, and overcome them, to offer them peace if they will profess the religion of Islam, to say to them: "Do you profess the religion of Islam? Now if they embrace Islam they are surely directed. Therefore, take not friends from among them until they fly their country for the religion of God."

"And when the month wherein you are allowed to attack them shall be passed, kill the idolators wheresoever ye shall find them, and take them prisoners, and besiege them, and lay wait for them, in every convenient place. But if they shall repent, and observe the appointed times of prayer, and pay the legal alms, dismiss them freely, for God is gracious and merciful."

"Fight against those who believe not in God, nor in the last day, and forbid not that which God and his apostle have forbidden, and profess not the true religion of those unto whom the Scriptures have been delivered, until they pay tribute by right of subjection, and they be reduced low."

"He who saith there is but one God, shall enter into Paradise."

If M. Ubicini had only said, the Turks do not proselytise after the manner of Christians, they do not seek the conversion of souls through missionary agencies, by means of books, tracts, sermons, prayers, schools, or the more material agencies employed in Ireland, for instance, of soup kitchens, weekly stipends, the buying up of unbelieving children, and caging them in proselytizing institutions, he would have simply stated the truth. The Turk has only one way of gaining over souls to his religion, sharp and speedy in its operation—the edge of the sword—and that instrument, fortunately for Christendom, is no longer available for proselytizing purposes.

M. Ubicini, the strenuous advocate of Turkish interests, informs us:

"The defeat of Navarino had, however, nearly occasioned the destruction of the Christian subjects of Turkey; for, on learning that disastrous affair, the Sultan Mahmoud for an instant entertained the idea of commanding a general extermination, by way of reprisal for what he considered—perhaps justly considered—a violation of the law of nations. Soon, however, regaining his self-possession, and that calm patience which was one of the great characteristics of his genius, and which neither reverses of fortune nor the injustice of cabinets could vanquish, he resumed his course of reform, and devoted his efforts principally to improving the condition of the rajahs, recognising in some measure their rights, and conceding the principle of equality before the law, on which, some few years later, the Khatti-sherif of Gul-Khane was founded."*

The successors of Mohammed professed to act, in all their wars, in strict conformity with the terrible injunction of the Koran: "Make war upon all who believe neither in God nor in the last judgment, and who abstain not from things forbidden by God and his prophet.

* Ubicini, Letters on Turkey.

"Also upon the Kitabi, who profess not the true religion, until they shall become humble, and bring the tribute with their own hands."

But it is hardly necessary to say, in the fury of battle, and uncontrolled ferocity and rapacity of a victorious army of Arab fanatics and plunderers, on the capture of a town or city, it mattered little for a time whether the defeated Kitabi, Jews, and Christians, were contented to abandon their religion, and thus entitle themselves, not only to quarter, but all the rights and privileges of Mussulmans, or to promise to pay tribute, still retaining their faith, and thus save their lives, and remain in the abject condition of Rajahs. A great or small massacre was generally the result of a defeat in the field; but when a capitulation was entered into by the Turks, and the people surrendered on the condition of safety for life and property, and freedom for the exercise of religion, so long as the tribute was paid by the rajahs, the terms of the capitulation were strictly and religiously observed by the Turks. This is a very memorable fact, which has been forced on my attention in my inquiries respecting the dominion of the Saracens, and that of the Turks also, in all periods of their history.

The idolatrous Arabs and apostates had not the privilege accorded to the Kitabis (those who had the books of Moses or of Jesus), they were only permitted to choose between Islamism and the sword. The admirers and apologists of Mohammedanism, and the eulogists of Mohammed say—the capitulations accorded to Jews and Christians secured to them perfect toleration in religious matters, the right to worship God after their own free will, and full protection for person and property, on the sole condition of paying tribute to their generous conquerors. There are some grains of truth in these statements, but there are great errors which are mixed up with them. I admit freely that the rajahs who paid tribute were permitted the exercise of their religion in ordinary times, and so far the conduct of the Mohammedans contrasts very favourably indeed for them, when compared with the conduct of

Christian states towards the people of another Christian creed whom they had brought under subjection, and maintained in it by means which may be truly designated as barbarous in the extreme. But to say that the rajahs of Mohammedan sovereigns ever *enjoyed* full protection for person or property in their abject condition of pardoned infidels existing on sufferance, a degraded and contemned population, in the midst of a proud, ignorant, privileged, and brutal community of Moslem masters, I must deny.

No writer more misleads his readers than Gibbon on this point, and indeed, unfortunately, on most points, whenever an advantage is to be gained for the Koran and Mohammedans, by his mode of setting up for the excellence of that system of Unitarian Islamism, and disabling the benefits of Christianity. He tells us that when defeated Jews or Christians were confronted with the Saracenic or Ottoman conqueror, they were *merely* called on to confess "there is no God but one God, and that Mohammed was his prophet." But if they do not choose to make this confession, then they had only to undertake to pay a light tribute, and they had perfect freedom for the exercise of their religion, and full protection for life and property.

Let us see what the exact terms of these capitulations were, after the capitulation of Jerusalem to the caliph Omar, in the year 637 A.D. had furnished a formula which served as the model of all the subsequent analogous conventions between the Mussulmans and Christians.

The capitulation granted by the caliph Omar, in the year A.D. 637, to the Christians at Jerusalem, at the capture of that city by the Saracens, served as the model of most of the subsequent conventions entered into between the Turkish conquerors and the conquered Christians. The terms of capitulation of Omar were substantially as follows:

The Christians shall pay an annual tribute to the Karadi.

They shall not ride on horses, nor use saddles, after the manner of Moslems.

They shall not bear arms, nor use the Arab tongue in the mottoes of their seals, nor sell wines of any sort.

They shall all wear similar clothing, and girdles outside their garments.

They shall not place crosses on their churches, nor display openly, in the cities of Mussulmans, crosses.

They shall not disturb the city with the noise of bells, and shall only cause one stroke of a bell to be sounded as a call for prayer.

The caliph insured to the Christians the safety of their lives, security of their property, protection of their places of worship, the freedom of the exercise of their religion. The patriarch and certain dignitaries of his church were exempted from the Karadi impost.

Nor were these terms materially departed from at the capture of Constantinople, eight centuries later. The patriarch had additional honours and privileges conferred on him by Mohammed the Second; but the original terms of the Saracenic capitulations were altered for the worse in respect to protection for Christian places of worship, Mohammed made a partition of them between the Turks and Christians.

This was the Turkish theory of capitulations with conquered Christians; but the practice of Turkish rule over them was a regime of insolent, overbearing arrogance, and contempt; of capricious despotism, ever and anon bursting forth, and manifesting its power in sudden raids on towns and villages, in acts of rapacity at the hands of greedy and needy local rulers, or a brutal, lawless soldiery, nominally under their command.

"As for those Christians (says Fuller) who lived in Palestine under the Turks, they had no lease of their safety, but were tenants at will of those tyrants for their lives and goods. Though persecution rained not always down right, yet the storm hung over their heads. Their minds were ever in torture, being continually on the rack of suspense and fear. And Simon, the patriarch of Jerusalem, himself was no better

than an honourable slave (on his patriarchal throne), as appeareth by his letters of complaint."*

All that Gibbon has said of the beneficial change in the condition of the Greeks, after the downfall of the empire, may possibly apply to it in Constantinople and other cities, and some of the large towns in their vicinity, but it certainly is totally inapplicable to the condition of the Rajahs in the distant provinces of the Turkish empire.

These terms were, perhaps, more than could be expected from a Mohammedan sovereign, and as long as the Caliph Omar remained in Jerusalem, they served to protect the Christians from persecution, oppression, and rapacity; but when the caliph left these Christians to the tender mercies of his lieutenants, the capitulation treaty was of small advantage to them.

It has been so long and loudly rung into our ears that the Turks are the most tolerant of rulers, the least disposed to meddle with the religious opinions of their subjects, as their Christian slaves are termed, or to molest them on account of their faith, that we are disposed to receive the assertion as an indisputable fact, and yet no statement can be more at variance with historical truth.

In the reigns of the thirty-two sultans who have governed the Turkish Empire from the period of the capture of Constantinople, to that of the rule of the present sovereign, in all probability there has not been a single reign in which a massacre of Christians has not taken place, or been contemplated, on account of the deadly hostility of Turkish rulers, or the great body of the Turkish people, to the religion of the Christian unoffending rajahs of the empire. We find in Turkish history, authentic accounts of constant recurrence, of Christians having been massacred in some one or other of the provinces.

Whenever the empire was threatened with any great danger

* "The History of the Holy War," by Thomas Fuller, book i. chap. 7.

from without, or suffered any signal disasters within its territories, a Christian massacre has been uniformly projected, perpetrated, or with difficulty prevented. This was the case in the time even of Mohammed the Second, when he was menaced with a Hungarian war.

Mohammed the Second, the conqueror of Constantine the Ninth and last Emperor of the Greeks, the captor of Constantinople, inaugurated his accession to the Ottoman throne, in A.D. 1451, by the murder of his infant brother, in pursuance of the policy of imperial fratricide, which, at a later period of his reign, he publicly declared, a necessary law of the State.

When Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks, in 1453, after a siege of fifty-two days, the population, according to Gibbon, did not exceed 100,000 inhabitants.

M. Ubicini's estimate of the Greek population is far below Gibbon's, but is manifestly erroneous. He says, in his second volume—"If we were to give credit to the accounts of the Greeks, we must believe that more than 40,000 persons were slain, and 70,000 reduced to slavery in a city, whose total population, according to an estimate taken at the beginning of the siege, *could scarcely have exceeded thirty thousand or forty thousand.*"

According to Gibbon, in the first heat of pursuit there were about two thousand Christians put to the sword; but the victors acknowledged they should immediately have given quarter, had not the valour, with which they were at first resisted, prepared them for a similar opposition in every part of the capital. Above sixty thousand Greeks, he says, were seized in San Sophia, and other Catholic churches, and carried into slavery. Vast numbers, however, were slain in the churches, and in the cloisters of religious houses.

One of the first acts of the blood-stained conqueror, after the capture of the city, was to urge his horse through the porch of the church of St. Sophia, and to make his appearance in a state bordering upon frenzy, mounted on horseback, in the celebrated temple of the unfortunate Christians. The next place he visited

was the palace of the slain Christian Emperor, and as he made his way through the spacious halls, and was struck with the solitude and desolation which he witnessed, he repeated sentimentally, some lines of the Persian poet Ferdousi:—"The spider weaves his web in the palace of the Cæsars, and the owl is the sentinel in the watch tower of Afrasiab." And then the poetry of the Turkish sovereign vanished into thin air, and he repaired to a sumptuous banquet which had been prepared for him in the vicinity.

"There (says Professor Creasy) he drank deeply of wine, and he ordered the chief of his eunuchs to bring to him the youngest child of the Grand Duke Nicholas Notaras, a boy fourteen years of age. Notaras, during the siege, only betrayed the qualities of a factious bigot; but he now acted as became a Christian, a father, and a man. He told the messenger that his child should never be exposed to the sultan's brutality, and that he would rather see him under the executioner's axe. Furious at hearing this reply, *Mohammed ordered Notaras and his whole family to be seized, and put to death.* Notaras met his fate with dignity, and exhorted his children to die as fitted Christians. He saw their heads fall, one by one, before him, and then, after having asked a few moments for prayer, he gave himself up to the executioner, acknowledging, with his last breath, the justice of God. The bloody heads were brought to Mohammed, and placed by his order before him on the banquet table. Many more executions of noble Christians followed on that day, to please the tyrant's savage mood, and it was said that the natural ferocity of Mohammed was goaded on by the malevolent suggestions of a French renegade, whose daughter, in the sultan's harem, was at that time the object of his passionate fondness.*

So much for the magnanimous conqueror's generosity and toleration, on the occasion of the capture of Constantinople, of which even English historians are not ashamed to speak in terms of eulogy. But the atrocities I have referred to were

* Professor Creasy's History of the Ottoman Turks, vol. i. p. 188.

immediately after the city had been taken, when the Turkish conqueror was intoxicated with success, half frenzied with the carnage of the Christians, and when he was half drunk, too, with wine. But when he came to his senses, his advisers reasoned with him on the inexpediency of the course he was pursuing; so Sultan Mohammed sober, was no longer the same person as Sultan Mohammed drunk. He allowed himself to be persuaded that a great city like Constantinople would be of no advantage without inhabitants who followed trades, and various handicraft pursuits, which it would be beneath the dignity of Moslems to carry on. And, inasmuch as the late Greek Emperor, Constantine IX., had rendered himself very obnoxious to his people by changing the religion of the State, and conforming to the Church of Rome, he was brought to think it would be politic to put a stop to the massacre of the inhabitants, to enter into a treaty with the heads of the Greek church, who had resisted the late changes in religion, guaranteeing the lives of the inhabitants, and the exercise of their religion.

Within a period of two years, Sultan Mohammed the Second completed the ruin of the Greek Empire, nearly effected in several of the provinces by the capture of Constantinople and the consequences of it. In 1454, the Peloponnesus was conquered by him. The year following Trebezond shared the same fate.

Servia and Bosnia were subdued, and reduced to Turkish provinces. The last King of the Bosnians and his sons surrendered to Mohammed, on a solemn capitulation, formally entered into with the sultan, whereby the lives of the Christian sovereign and his sons were guaranteed, "and the sultan swore to observe the same." The never-failing perfidy of the Turkish character was not kept long in the back-ground on this solemn occasion of plighted faith. Mohammed determined to break his oath, and to violate the treaty he had entered into; but as he was a pious Mussulman prince, he counselled the Mufti on the lawfulness of so doing before he murdered the captives whose lives he had guaranteed. The holy head of Islam—

Mufti Ali Bestami—gave a decision in conformity with the sultan's wishes, and the sacred doctrines of the Koran, as they were interpreted by him :—" *The sultan's treaty and oath were not binding on him, being made with unbelievers, and he was at liberty to put his prisoners to death.*" The Mufti, in his zeal for the religion of Mohammed, craved a favour of the sultan, that he might be permitted to be, in this case, the executioner, as well as the interpreter, of the holy law of Islam. The unfortunate captive Christian sovereign of Bosnia, was brought before the sultan. He came into Mohammed's presence with the treaty of capitulation in his hand. The pious Mufti came to the relief of the sultan's mind from any little embarrassment the sight of that solemn treaty, which he had sworn to observe might have caused him.

" It is a good deed," said the pious Mufti, " to kill such infidels." And hereupon the holy man of the law drew his own sabre from the scabbard, and cut down the Christian sovereign on the spot, and laid him dead before the face of the sultan.

The young Bosnian princes were put to death in a tent adjoining the place of their father's murder.

When the next oration in Parliament, or elaborate disquisition on Ottoman History in the press is made, in defence of the Turkish Empire, its grievously abused institutions, and the much injured character of its tolerant principles, I commend and recommend to the attention of the public, this little murderous episode in Turkish History.

Again, in the reign of the Sultan Selim I., the grandson of Mohammed II., about sixty years after the conquest, Cantemir relates in his " Histoire Ottomane " (vol. ii. p. 46), that Selim, who was remarkable for his Mussulman orthodoxy, came to the determination of ridding himself entirely of the Christians, or forcing them to embrace Islamism. He sent for the Mufti and propounded to him the following religious question : " Which of the two acts was the more meritorious—to subjugate the whole world or to convert infidels to Islamism ?" The Mufti not

suspecting the sultan's project, replied, that the conversion of infidels was the more meritorious and agreeable to God.

Selim, fortified by the decision of the head of his religion, then sent for the Grand Vizier, Peri Pacha, and made his will known to that great executive functionary of his government. "Too long," said the Sultan, "have these infidel rajahs polluted the air with their poisonous breath; let them either embrace the true faith, or disappear from my sight." The Grand Vizier in vain endeavoured to dissuade the sultan from his project, and having argued ineffectually against the impolicy of it, took his leave. He lost no time in consulting with the Mufti, and the result of that conference was to give warning of the danger to the Greek Patriarch, and to suggest the course he should adopt. The Patriarch solicited an audience with the sultan, and having obtained it with difficulty, appeared before the Divan at Adrianople, attended by the whole body of his clergy.

Pleading adroitly for toleration for the Christians of the empire, he quoted texts from the Koran against conversion by violent means, and the terms of the capitulation granted to the Greeks by Mohammed II. at the time of the capture, by which it appeared that although one half of the city had been taken by assault, the other half had surrendered voluntarily, and opened their gates to the sultan, on the faith of the treaty, accepted and sworn to by him. The original document could not be produced, having been destroyed by a fire in the capital, but the Patriarch asserted his readiness to supply its loss, by the testimony of three janissaries, still living, who had taken part in the conquest, remembered the capitulation entered into, and were ready to vouch for the truth of the statement.

The Patriarch's appeal was happily successful, the sultan abandoned his sanguinary project against the lives of the Christian rajahs, he restricted his fanatic zeal to the demolition of many churches, and the conversion of others into mosques. Among the latter was the Metropolitan Church of the Greeks,

which had been especially assigned to him by the conqueror Mohammed as a compensation for that of the holy Apostles, which had been converted into the mosque of the conqueror himself.

In the reign of Amurath IV., in 1640, the diabolical project of exterminating the Christian rajahs was again agitated in the Divan, in one of those panics of periodical recurrence in the Turkish capital. But the panic having fortunately subsided, the rajahs escaped extermination.

Again, in the reign of Sultan Mustapha III., in 1770, on the breaking out of an insurrection in the Morea, the result of Russian intrigues, the question of exterminating the Christians in Constantinople, was anew agitated in the Divan, and once more, fortunately, the fanaticism of fear abated, and the rajahs of the capital were spared.

In the beginning of 1821, in the reign of Sultan Mahmoud II., the news of the insurrections in the Morea and Moldavia, we are told by Ubicini, rendered the popular fury against the Christians, and particularly against the Greeks of Constantinople, uncontrollable. "The Divan, placed between two perils, terrified, on the one hand, by the violence of its Mussulman subjects, and distracted, on the other, by the menaces of insurrection which seemed to burst forth on all sides, perceived no safety but in the destruction of those it dreaded. A series of massacres commenced, and those Fanariotes who were known to be connected with the Hypsilantes and other leaders of the Hetairia, were the earliest victims, Michael Handjeri, Michael Mano, and Theodore Rizas, were executed in different quarters of Constantinople, having previously undergone a solemn anathema, from the Patriarch Gregory.

"A new Hatti-sheriff was issued, calling on all faithful Mussulmans, from seven to sixty years of age, to take up arms in defence of their country. Hordes of ferocious warriors arrived from the remote provinces of Asia, and mingled with the Janissaries; dervishes, with wild gesture and streaming hair,

ran through the city, exciting the populace against the Christians. The dwellings of the Greeks at Therapia, Buyukdere, and in the villages on the Bosphorus, were pillaged and burned: and even the Franks, though under the protection of their respective embassies, were afraid to appear in the streets.

"But all this terror and disorder was only the prelude to yet more terrible scenes that were to follow. On the 22nd of April, being Easter day, the greatest festival of the Greek church, at the conclusion of the Divine Service which he had been celebrating, Gregory, Patriarch of Constantinople, the head of the Greek church, acknowledged and appointed by the Porte, and who recently had issued a solemn anathema against the Greek insurgents, was seized and hanged before the gates of his own palace. The execution of Constantine Morousi, had taken place some days previously. His head was struck off under the very eyes of Sultan Mahmoud himself. Of these two men, thus hastily sacrificed without trial or opportunity of self-defence, one had lately exerted his ecclesiastical authority in the most solemn and potent form to repress the rebellion of his countrymen against the Porte.

"The Archbishops of Ephesus, Nicomedia, and Achiale, were the same day put to death in three different quarters of the city; the metropolitan Cyril underwent the same fate at Adrianople, whilst twelve other prelates, and several Greek merchants and notable persons, were hanged before their own dwellings. Massacres, the destruction of churches, and outrages of every sort ensued throughout Thrace, Macedonia, and Asia Minor. The brothers John and Charles Callimachi were beheaded, one at Cæsarea, the other at Boli, their respective places of banishment, and during two months a complete reign of terror prevailed." . . .

"The defeat of the Turks at Navarino, A.D. 1828, nearly occasioned the destruction of the Christian subjects of Turkey; for on learning that disastrous affair, the sultan Mahmoud for an instant entertained the idea of commanding a general extermination, by way of reprisal for what he considered,—perhaps

justly considered—a violation of the law of nations. Soon, however, regaining his self-possession, and the calm patience which was one of the characteristics of his genius, and which neither reverses of fortune, nor injustice of cabinets could vanquish, he resumed his course of reform, and devoted his efforts principally to improving the condition of the rajahs, recognising in some measure their rights, and conceding the principle of equality before the law, on which, some few years later, the Hatti-sheriff of Gul-Khane was founded."*

* Lettres sur la Turquie. Par M. Ubicini. Vol. ii.

CHAPTER XI.

Functionaries connected with the Religion of the State in Turkey.

It must be borne in mind, the Impostor, whom the Osmanli designate "The Prophet" was originally not only the spiritual guide, but the temporal governor of the Arabians or Saracens. He was at once Prince, Pontiff, Legislator, and Judge. His successors, when they became conquerors, thought it sufficient to be sovereigns, delegated their functions as pontiffs to subjects of theirs.

In the course of a few centuries, when the Saracens were weakened by a vast number of schisms in their religion, by strife and warfare, the Turcoman hordes called in to their aid became their tyrants, and eventually their masters. The successors of Mohammed, the caliphs, had to make way as temporal sovereigns, to Turkish governors, and military chiefs of the Turkish race. Those who managed to retain some semblance of authority, fell back on the original prestige and privileges of their sacred character as Imaums.

The Turks, however, no sooner constituted their government, than they separated the functions of the ruler of the state from those of a pontiff and Imaum. The sovereign of Turkey took the title of Padishah of the Ottomans (a term derived from the Persian, signifying Protector), as well as sultan. Some of the early Ottoman Monarchs added to the preceding title, the Turkistan term of dignity, of Tartar origin, Khan, which signifies "high

and mighty lord." The sultan, however, continued to be the representative of the prophet, and the depository of the Law of Islam, laid down in the sacred book, the Koran.

By the express terms of the law specified in the code "Multeka," it is declared that the supreme head of the Mussulmans shall not make the slightest change in any part of the sacred legislation, more especially if such change, by its nature and object, should tend to alter the condition of the nation, of the servants of God, confided to his care and protection." He must profess the doctrines of the Koran. He is the depository of the sacred code, and the guardian of the Canon law. He presides over public prayer on Fridays, and at the two festivals of the Bairam. In accordance with the words of the prophet, there can be no felicity nor salvation for a people governed by a woman. The code Multeka ordains that no woman shall have dominion over the true believers, as supreme head of the Mussulmans.

Ubicini, the second volume of whose work on Turkey appeared in 1854, notices a remarkable law, regulating the succession to the Ottoman crown. "The sceptre, instead of descending from father to son, devolves on the eldest surviving male of the imperial family, who may, perhaps, be a brother, uncle, or even cousin of the deceased sovereign. This law, instituted to avert the dangers of a minority, has, with one or two exceptions been strictly adhered to by the present dynasty."

In default of male heirs of the present line, the sultan must be chosen from the family of the ancient Khans of the Crimea, who are descended from the same stock. "It is impossible," continues Ubicini, "to calculate the political consequences of such an event, should it ever occur. It is not unlikely that the extinction of the Osman dynasty, would be followed by the immediate dissolution of the empire."*

Among the few exceptions to the rule strictly adhered to by the present dynasty, of which he makes mention, it is singular

* Lettres sur la Turquie, Tom. ii.

that Ubicini has not noticed the fact of the present sultan having succeeded his father.

The assertion of the sacredness and inviolability of the sultan is a constitutional doctrine. The meaning of it is said to be that the sultan cannot be put to death, or judicially punished, but he may be deposed with the sanction of the law and religion, even though neither his personal vices, nor his tyranny compel it (as the text of the law has it). History shows this is not a mere theory.

"Of seventy-two legitimate caliphs, from the seventh to the thirteenth century, at least one-third have been put to death or imprisoned. Of the thirty-two Ottoman sultans, only two have been put to death, but several of them have been deposed, or imprisoned for life."

Little can the perils be comprehended which surround a reforming Turkish sultan, who is not cognizant of the nature of the authority with which he is invested.

The law of the Multeka declares the sultan's sovereign rule is given him "to guard the interests of the community of which he is the delegate." The fact of his being a delegate implies that he is invested with a discretionary power, to adopt all preventive and repressive measures, required to secure the public safety. "But he is not invested with the power," says M. du Caurroy, "of departing from the law of the Koran. The obedience which *The Book* enjoins upon all believers, does not extend to commands contrary to its precepts, and those of the cheriat (legislation)."

"Let the faithful obey God, obey the prophet, and those amongst you who are clothed with authority." Such is the text of the Koran, to which Beidhawi adds the following commentary:—"But as respects the authorities subsequent to the prophet, such as caliphs, cadis, commanders of armies, obedience is only due to them in so far as they shall remain in the right path."

Every man of common sense in the Turkish dominions, who has a knowledge of the Koran, knows perfectly well that a

considerable number of the reforms made by Sultan Mahmoud, and his successor Abdul Medjid, at the pressing solicitation of some of the great Christian Powers, through their diplomatic agents at the Sublime Porte, *are departures from the law of the Koran, are contrary to its precepts, and those of the law founded on it, the Cheriat, and that obedience is not due to those by whom those reforms were made, because the latter have not remained, in what orthodox Mussulmans hold, to be the right path.* What are all the conspiracies we read of being detected and frustrated in Constantinople, since the latter years of the late, and throughout the reign of the present sultan, up to the present time, and what are all the plots, against the life and government of the latter of which we hear so frequently being discovered, and rendered abortive, but so many practical inferences drawn from the doctrines of the Koran, and the opinion of the orthodox expounders of it and believers in it?

The Ulema constitute a College of Theologians, not endowed with any spiritual functions, or sacred offices as ministers of religion, but privileged to exercise some at certain state solemnities, and on festivals of importance, without having received any ordination as priests.

The term Ulema signifies learning—instruction. The body to whom that name was originally given were so deemed, because they could read and write, had made one book their study, and that book was the Koran. In the flourishing era of the first Abasside caliphs, within a century of the time of Mohammed, there were men of learning and instruction, who were theologians, and interpreters of the law, as the Ulemas of Turkey are, but they were of a different race, they were Saracens, with intellectual organizations, natural tastes for arts and letters, and tendencies towards civilization altogether different from those of Tartar origin, the Turks, who unhappily superseded the Arabs. The age I speak of was that of the four great Imaums, Abou Hanifeh, Schafih, Malikih, and Hambelih. In Bagdad especially, the Bulwark of the Saints, and doctors of the Law of Islam, the disciples and successors of the Imaums,

contributed largely to the reputation of "The Wonderful City," by those schools and colleges, wherein we are told at one period there were six thousand students and professors.

The first Imaums of the caliphates, men of learning and instruction, were, in fact the priests and Ulemas of the Saracens, men of prayer as well as study, endowed with sacred functions, as well as those appertaining to theological and literary pursuits. Miserably represented are these Saracen sacred ministers, doctors of law, scholars, and enlightened men of instruction, by the dull, drowsy Ulemas of Turkey, richly endowed, indeed, but not with spiritual or intellectual gifts and graces.

In Turkey the two functions of interpreters of the law, and ministers of religion, were originally united in the order of Ulemas, as they had been in the person of the early caliphs. These were competent to perform the duties of cadis or judges, in virtue of their office as interpreters of the law, and as ministers of religion, Imaums to perform the sacerdotal office.

But in course of time the sultans, finding the Ulemas too powerful for them, having the law and religion of the land in their unholy keeping, reduced the Ulemas, Cadis, and Imaums to distinct bodies. The Ulemas became what they now are, doctors of theology; but from their body the officials must come who are appointed Cadis. The jurisdiction, however, of the Ulemas and Cadis is separate. To the Imaums now exclusively belong the ordinary functions of ministers of religion in the mosques, at funerals, and marriages, but they enjoy no power in the State, no influence over the people, as priests do in European countries.

The foundation of all law, civil and religious, is the law of Islam, and the supreme authority is exercised and executed by the sultan, and that exercise and execution cannot be called in question so long as the fundamental principles of religion, laid down in the Koran, are not violated. The sultan's authority, legislative and executive, is executed either directly, or primarily through the medium of two functionaries, the Grand Vizier, and the Sheik-ul-Islam (the head of the Ulemas),

who is also styled Mufti. The office of Grand Vizier dates from the time of the first Abasside caliph, A.D. 750.

The grand vizier, as his title imports, is the "bearer of burdens;" he is the prime minister, president of the privy council, or Divan, or Sublime Porte; disposes of public offices of importance, countersigns all imperial edicts, and governmental ordinances, commands the army in person or by deputy, and is the wielder of the executive power, as the delegate of the sultan. But by the same supreme authority of the sultan, to which he owes his elevation, he can be deprived of it.

Not so with the other chief pillar of the Ottoman government, the Sheik-ul-Islam, or Mufti—his office and his person are sacred and inviolable, except in cases of abused power, of signal scandal and detriment to religion. The law forbids the blood of a Ulema to be shed. Amurath IV., however, made away with a refractory Mufti; it is stated that the sultan had recourse to an ingenious device to get rid legally of the obnoxious chief of the sacred order of Ulemas, who had opposed his will, by having him pounded to death in a mortar.

The Mufti is the interpreter of the law of Islam, the guardian of religion, the director of the conscience of the State in all matters affecting faith and morals.

The Mufti is not a minister of religion who exercises sacerdotal functions, except in some particular instances, nor are those functions exercised professionally and ordinarily by the Ulemas. The Imaums are the priests of Mohammedanism. The Sheik-ul-Islam is of equal authority with the Grand Vizier, the chief of the Ulema, a body of theologians, who exercise both judicial and deliberative religious functions. The Sheik-ul-Islam is the keeper of the seals, his *fetvah* (or seal and cyph.) is essential to the validity of every imperial edict, an act emanating from the sovereign authority, as declaratory of its conformity with the Koran, and therefore binding on the faithful. Armed with this formidable power of the fetvah (which the recent reforms have not touched), the Muftis at various times have overawed and over-ruled the Sultans, and caused

the depositions of several—the death of some of them. Another power of great magnitude in a state is enjoined by the Mufti; his jurisdiction extends over public colleges and schools, in which youth is instructed in religion. "He is the grand master of the university, and dean of the schools," to use the words of Ubicini.

His power and privileges have been respected by the present reforming Sultan, as they were by his successor. In the composition of the divan and Privy Council, his dignity, eminence, and influence, are equally manifest.

The following is the order of the several dignitaries of state composing the council, styled "Mushirs or Councillors:"

The Grand Vizier, the Sheik-ul-Islam, the Seraskier (minister of war), the Captain Pacha (minister of marine), the Commandant of Artillery and Governor-General of all Fortresses, the Minister of Foreign Affairs (styled *reis effendi*, previously to Sultan Mohammed's time), the Minister of Commercial and of Public Works, the Mustachir, Adviser of the Grand Vizier (equivalent to Home Secretary, formerly styled Kiaja Bey), the Minister of Police, the President of the Council of State, the Intendant of the Mint, the Intendant of Vakoufs (administrator of all property set apart for the maintenance of mosques and charitable foundations).

The whole body of the judicial magistracy in Turkey has been compared to a pyramid of which the apex is the Sheik-ul-Islam, and the base the Naibs, or judges of the fifth order. The Sheik-ul-Islam receives a salary equivalent to £11,040 sterling a year. He proposes to the Sultan through the medium of the Grand Vizier, the judges of the first and second rank, the two Cadi-askers of Roumelia and Anatolia, the Mollah of Mecca, the Grand Judge of Constantinople, the Mollahs of Adrianople, Broussa, Beirout, and Cairo, the Makhredii, Mollahs of several other places, and has the privilege of appointing, independently of the Grand Vizier, or even the Sultan, the Muffelichs, or judges of the third order.

The Ulema are generally recruited from the poorer classes.

To rise in their profession to any eminence, or even to gain a bare maintenance by its exercise, they must undergo a long and arduous noviciate. Their term of probation and preparation is one of privation which the sons of Effendis would not be enclined to encounter, or able to sustain. The novice, at the age of eleven or twelve, who is taken from the primary school for the children of the poor, has to pass through several grades in the college or Medresseh he has entered, before he can attain to eligibility in the rank of Muderris, or professors, the midway stage in his laborious career. These colleges or medressehs are connected with the principal mosques. Attached to each college is a large building called Tetimneh, consisting of small cells open to the heavens, furnished with a mat and a straw cushioned couch, or divan. Here, engaged in the study of the Koran and its commentaries, and attending the college course of education, the student spends ten or twelve years, very miserably provided for by the commissioners of the property of the mosques—vacoufs. Each morning he receives from the adjacent market a portion of bread and pilau for his support, and in aid of his maintenance he is allowed to employ his leisure for his own account, as a writer or translator from the Turkish, Arabic, or Persian.

After ten or twelve years assiduous study, he is allowed to undergo examination, and if duly qualified to obtain the diploma of Moutazim, or candidate for the first degree of the order of Ulema.

At this grade he becomes eligible to the office of Naib, or provincial judge; but in the event of aiming at the higher dignity of the law, he must devote himself more to the study of the jurisprudence, emanating from the most recondite doctrines of the Koran, and orthodox commentaries upon it. At the expiration of the term of the Moutazimat, he has to undergo another severe examination, and when he passes it, is promoted to the rank of professor in the hierarchy of the Ulemas. This second step, as well as the first, is conferred by

the Sheik-ul-Islam in person. Henceforward both judicial branches of the Majutraes are open to him.

The next step of preferment to which he can aspire, is to the office of Mufti in a Mevleviet, but higher than that dignity he cannot ascend. If, however, he remains in the rank of professor, or Muderris, he can go through the ten prescribed degrees of the professorship, till he attains that of the Suleimaniie. He has then reached the highest class of Ulema, and gets the title of Mollah Makredji, which entitles him to aspire to the dignity of Mollah of Stamboul, or even of Sheik-ul-Islam itself.

"The Ulema (says Ubicini) are divided into two branches, the judicial, composed of the judges and interpreters of the law; and the religious, to which the ministers of public worship belong.

"Originally these two functions were united in the Ulema, as they had been in the person of the sovereign; the Cadi was competent to perform the sacerdotal office, and the Imaum to perform that of a judge; after a time the Cadis became a distinct body, who claimed the enjoyment of the judicial employments to the exclusion of the Imaums, who were restricted to preaching and the service of the mosque.

"The judicial branch of the Ulema acquired a great pre-eminence over the other from the character of their authority, their high political functions, and the advantage of retaining in their ranks the highest dignitaries, and the head of the body. The administration of vacoufs, and the right of appropriating a fortieth part of all disputed property submitted to their jurisdiction, added greatly to their power, and they took care to admit amongst their members none but men of talent and capacity.

"The sacerdotal division, barely supported by the endowment of the mosques, and often forced to have recourse to manual labour to supply the insufficiency of their revenue, were placed in the lowest ranks of the Ulema, and sometimes, especially the

inferior Imaums, scarcely recognized as belonging to that body. Thus we see in Turkey at the present day that the ministers of religion are subordinate to the civil magistrate. Still the principle of the union of the two authorities has not been altogether lost sight of. On the accession of the Sultan, the Mufti claims the right of reciting the customary prayer, whilst the two almoners or Imaums of the imperial palace rank in the highest class of the magistrature.

"The hierarchy, or order of ranks, dates from the same epoch as the constitution of the Ulema from the reign of Mohammed II. Its details are extremely complicated, and are little understood even in Turkey. This complexity is not to be attributed only to the minute and methodical character of the Turks, but likewise to the tendency which all corporate bodies have to multiply within themselves distinctions and degrees of rank.

"The great body of the Ulema comprehends these three classes of functionaries:—

1st. The administrators of justice, designated by the title of Cadis.

2nd. The teachers or interpreters of the law, *muftis*.

3rd. The ministers of religion, Imaums."*

We are accustomed to hear that there are no ministers of religion, in our sense of the term, priests or prelates in Turkey, and therefore that Mohammedan countries are exempt from those debasing superstitions "which degrade the intellect and enslave the soul," elsewhere. This is a great mistake. In Constantinople there are 877 mosques, of which nineteen are imperial mosques, the greater part endowed by former Sultans. The number of Imaums and Sheiks, secular ministers of religion, Khatibs and Kayims, is very considerable. There are very few doctrines inculcated in the public prayers, or taught in commentaries of the Koran, or exhortations given in mosques, that are not at variance with the principles of justice, or tolera-

* Letters on Turkey, &c. Translated from the French of M. A. Ubicini.

tion, or humanity, as well as of Christianity. There is not only in those teachings, and preachings, and praying, in Turkish mosques, an abundance of superstitions, but a superabundance of that commodity.

The imperial mosques have generally an ecclesiastical staff, of a Sheik, a Khatib, several Imaums, twelve Muezzins, and twenty Kayims maintained on the vacouf. Yet we are told by travellers in Turkey, there are no priests, no persons having spiritual functions, consequently no superstitions in the Turkish empire.

The Imaums are very badly paid, and are barely recognised by the Ulemas as the lowest branch of their order, and most abject of all functionaries in connexion with it; and have generally to perform some menial offices, or to exercise some calling, especially as writers and copyists of books, to eke out the slender pittance they receive for their sacerdotal services, to enable them to live. Imaums are now subordinate to the civil power, and by it they may be removed or displaced at will.

The functions they perform in the mosques are these :—

They recite five times a day (except at the solemn prayer-time on Fridays), the Namaz, which every person present repeats in a low tone, they perform the accompanying services, assist at circumcisions, marriages, and burials. The Sheiks, or elders, belong to the Ulemas, and are of the grade of professors —Muderris. Their duty is to deliver an exhortatron to the faithful in the mosques, after mid-day prayer.

The Kayims are subordinate to the Imaums, simply care-takers of mosques, lighters of lamps, &c.

The Muezzin's functions are limited to the summoning of true believers to prayer, from the minarets of the several mosques.

The great body of the Ulemas, then, comprehends three classes of functionaries, the two first mentioned of great power and influence, directly or indirectly exercised :

1. Administrators of justice—Cadis.

2. Interpreters of the law and teachers of doctrine—Muftis.

3. The ministers of religion—Imaums.

In the present official order of precedence, eminence, and dignity, the Ulemas, as interpreters of the law, and Cadis, or judicial functionaries, rank as follows:

1. The Mollahs. Grand Judges.

2. The Muftis, who constitute a body of about two hundred members of equal rank, holding office for life. Their duties consist in examining legal processes and giving fetvahs or sanctions under their hand and seal, to establish the rights of parties to appear before the tribunals, and to give their opinions of the bearing of the law in relation to them. These functions consist in interpreting the Koran and its commentaries, assisting at great assemblies, and giving their opinions on the law in all controversies respecting it. The fetvah is not intended, or meant to prejudge the case at issue, but to legalize the process of litigation. The codes of fetvahs are very numerous and correspond to the reports of precedents and judgments in European tribunals. There is a Mufti in every district or caza, excepting Brousa and Adrianople, which are included in the judicial arrangements of the capitol. The Muftis are chosen out of the Ulemas having attained the rank of professors—They are appointed by the Sheik-ul-Islam, and have fixed salaries.

The administration of justice is divided in Turkey into:

1st. A supreme court of justice, or appeal, which decides without appeal. At the head of the first is the Arzodaci, composed of two presidencies, that of Roumelia for Europe, and of Anatolia for Asia. At the head of the first is the Kazi-asker (literally military judge) of Roumelia, assisted by ten grand assistant judicial assessors, who hold the presidency in turn for a year.

At the head of the second is the Kazi-asker of Anatolia, similarly constituted. The two Kazi-askers are the chiefs of the magistracy in Europe and Asia, *under* the sanction of the Sheik-ul-Islam. The two Kazi-askers appoint to all judicial vacancies in their respective departments.

The second division of the judicial administration of the Turkish empire, is that of the Mevleviets, twenty-four in number, or grand judicial councils, corresponding to courts of appeal, at the head of which is a grand judge—Mollah, and comprising a certain number of Kazas, or ordinary tribunals.

These ordinary tribunals for the trial of civil causes, in number 126, are composed of:

1. The Mollah, or Cadi, chief judge.
2. The Mufti (interpreters of the law of Islam).
3. The Naib (assessor).
4. Ayuk Nahib (deputy).
5. Bach Kiatib (notary).

An appeal lies from their decisions.

The deputy-judges, Ayak Nahibs, act as inferior judges in their several districts.

From the foregoing notices of this powerful body of the Ulema, it must be evident that the influence derived from their supreme control in matters of religion, and their intimate connexion and alliance with the administration of the law, and all its highest offices, concentrates in them all the vital energies of their religion, and obtains for them the greatest privileges the state can confer. It is hardly necessary to say that their interests, and those of the reforming advisers of the Sultan, are diametrically opposed, and are continually conflicting, but not in newspapers, in public assemblies, or councils of state. The controversies the Ulemas have with the Sultan, and the Tanzimat with the Giaours in Stamboul, who have been the secret advisers of the measures of innovation, transpire in a different form, in the shape of conspiracy, of combination with the fanaticism of dervishes, of plots vaguely revealed in the capitol, and disorders in the distant provinces in the form of raids and massacres in districts inhabited by Christian rajahs, unaccountably occasioned and originated.

CHAPTER XII.

The Institution of the Dervishes.

MOHAMMEDANISM has its monastic orders, varying from one another in degrees of asceticism, strictness of life, and devotion to corporate interests, clothed in religious garbs.

The fanaticism of Mohammedanism finds expression, representation, vitality, and activity in this institution. The Dervishes pretend to lead contemplative lives, make vows of poverty and mortification, and profession of humility, seclusion and separation from worldly cares and sordid interests. They have no opinion of the sanctity or spirituality of the secular order of sacred functionaries, the Ulemas, who are mere theologians, and the Ulemas look on and speak of the illiterate devotees, the Dervishes, with profound contempt. Nevertheless, whenever the Ulemas believe that the interests of their order are jeopardized, by any innovations or reforms attempted by a sultan or his ministers, and the cry is got up in the medressehs, "Religion is in danger," when the revenues of the mosques, the yacoufs administered by the Ulemas are imperilled, they enter into no violent contests, no unseemly controversies with the State, and, above all, with the supreme chief of it. They are too closely connected with it, too loyal or too wily to take that course. They adopt another, they pass the word of alarm for the faith of Islam, stealthily and cautiously from the chief of one order of dervishes to that of

another in the capital; it is transmitted with like secresy to the provinces, and in due time the reforming government is awakened by seditious cries in Stamboul, or news of disturbances, and massacres of Christians in distant parts, from its pleasant dreams of renovation and regeneration, of credit restored, of public order permanently established, of foreign loans effected with facility, of revenue mortgaged, and the property of the religious and charitable foundations of the empire that is to be made available hereafter, and converted into securities for the contemplated contracts with the capitalists of London and Paris.

There are very few very grave disorders and massacres of Christians on a grand scale in the provinces that are not planned in the capital, and in the concoction of which, concert between the Ulemas and the Dervishes cannot be traced. In the recent massacres in Syria, that concert is said by many well-informed persons, with whom I have conversed in the Levant, to have included an imperial prince, no less a personage than the brother of the sultan.

Dervishes originally were religious persons, who abandoned all worldly goods and interests, professedly to serve God and their fellow creatures, in conformity with the view of obligation imposed on all believers in the Koran—"He is the best of men who is most useful to his fellow men." The word Dervish is Persian, significative of a state of mendicancy, that of a homeless wayworn stranger.

These ascetics are scattered, not only over the Turkish Empire, but throughout Persia and Hindostan, under various denominations, Dervishes, Santons, Sofis, and Fakirs.

The Dervishes attribute their origin to the Caliph Ali. Certain illumined followers of his formed a society called Safashafei, or men devoted to a contemplative life, of singular purity, and exalted aspirations.

In a short time this order, like many other religious orders (obeying the law that regulates all human institutions), departed from its first principles, perverted them, exaggerated the im-

portance of the most trivial rites and tenets, and depreciated the value of the highest and holiest of their doctrines.

They gave themselves up wholly to mysticism, asceticism, to practices both in the way of discipline and the use of drugs, calculated to promote reveries, trances, ecstacies, and temporary hallucinations, accompanied with paroxysms of delirium. In their transports of mental disorder, and orgies of religious enthusiasm, they fell into practises abounding in fantastic absurdities, and excesses of a sanguinary and ferocious spirit of self-mortification, such practices as mutilating their members, scarifying their bodies, lacerating their flesh, resting for a lengthened period in agonising positions, half famishing themselves, &c.

Yet, with all this outward demonstration of self-sacrifice and endurance of cruel sufferings, professedly for the honour and glory of God, and out of devotion to the faith and law of Islam, the Dervishes managed to make a false conscience for themselves, and to reconcile sensuality in their private lives, with claims to spirituality in their devotional characters and exercises.

The origin of the leading doctrines of the Dervishes ascends higher than the caliphate of Ali, to which they ascribe it. Those leading doctrines took their rise in the soffism of Persia, and some parts of Arabia, which existed in those regions long prior to Mohammed's imposture, and which certainly has striking analogies with the mystic lore of the Pythagorean schools and sects, and those of the Neo Platonic philosophy of Alexandria traceable as it is supposed, in the religions of the remotest theocracies of Egypt and India.

Two centuries before Mohammed's time there were two sects in Arabia, designated the Walkers—Meschaiouns,—and the Contemplatives—Ischrachiouns,—which recall, by similarity of designation and of doctrine, in some particular tenets, the systems of the two great philosophic schools of Greece. But the grand conceptions, and ennobling principles of the divine Plato, or mixture of truth and religion in the metaphysics of

Aristotle, are not to be found in the doctrines of those Arabian rationalistic and mystic sects.

When the new religious element was added to these two Pagan systems, they merged into two schools, that of the Meschaiouns into Mutekelim—Metaphysicians— and the Ischrachaiouns into the Sofis—corresponding in their doctrines to those now designated Pantheists.

The Sofis resolved everything in nature, mind as well as matter, into God; everything in the universe they held emanated from him, as rays from the sun, and all things returned to and were absorbed in him, as rain is blended with the sea. Hence the Sofis inculcated this leading doctrine of theirs, that perpetual adoration of God in his works was an obligation. "Worship God in his creatures." Whatever suited their views and harmonised with their system in the Koran they adopted. They acknowledged the divine mission of Mohammed, but they made a sophism of the Koran, and their own use of his doctrines, twisted them from their obvious meaning, and the evident intention of their author. They certainly found one doctrine which they did not alter or abbreviate, in the Koran, pure and simple in its expression of the grand principle of Soffism,—"God caused the creature (says the Koran) to emanate from, and afterwards to return to himself."

Ubicini, speaking of the doctrines of the Sofis, says, "For my own part I am not acquainted with any more abominable doctrine than this rationalism, which tends to substitute the creature for the creator, and which leads fatally and certainly to the destruction of all belief and all morality. The pernicious character of such a system is increased by its disguising its corruption under a plausible exterior, specially adapted to lead astray the finest minds; and to it may be attributed what Quinctilian said of the style of Seneca; 'Eo perniciosior quod abundat dulcibus vitiis.'"

"This idealism invariably terminates in a materialism, aggravated by an inordinate refinement of sensuality. Gross materialism is infinitely less dangerous, because it openly

affronts the secret instincts of human conscience; but the mystical reveries of Sofism are as a snare set to pervert the most innocent and the noblest inclinations of our nature. These elements of disease and dissolution, which had been cast by Sofism into the heart of Mussulman society, did not at first manifest themselves; they were held in check for a time, as we have said by the sincerity and the austere morality of their original teachers. But they gradually permeated, and insinuated themselves into all the veins and arteries of the social body. Egypt, which had previously been the cradle of monachism, became the nursery of a new school of ascetics."

In the second century of the Hegira, about the year 729, Sheikh Olivan, a Sofi, highly esteemed for his virtue and his learning, founded the first religious order in Islam, and gave it his own name.

This innovation encountered a great opposition on the part of the legistes, and the orthodox followers of Islam, who recalled the declaration of Mohammed: *No Monachism in Islam.*

But though this sentence, which became almost proverbial, was received by all Mussulmans as an article of faith, the tendency of the Arabs to a solitary and contemplative life soon prevailed over orthodoxy. Other orders speedily arose in imitation of that of Sheikh Olivan. The number of these increased rapidly, especially from the second to the seventh century. Von Hammer reckons thirty-six of these orders, which he enumerates, following the estimate of D'Ohsson. Of this number twelve existed previously to the founding of the Ottoman Empire; the eighteen others arose between the fourteenth and the eighteenth centuries." *Ubicini, "Lettres sur la Turquie."*

Sofism had then passed from a doctrine to an institution, and had assumed a political character. The different orders of Dervishes became its disciples and representatives. Their mystic religion embraced two systems of doctrines, one for the multitude, another for the initiated—the adepts. The initiated held that the Koran was not a book of divine origin or autho-

rity, but was only a political system of surpassing wisdom, and was a dead letter until it was rendered vital by interpretation at the hands of spiritualised men, who had contemplated God, and had abstracted their minds from earthly cares and concerns. An intimate union of religious enthusiasm and sacerdotal cunning and imposture became the fixed basis of the operations of the Dervishes in establishing a character for saintly men eminent for their spirituality.

"I have already mentioned the invocation of the founder of the Mevlevis (who was also regarded by the Dervishes in general as one of the greatest authorities in spiritual life): 'O my master! you have finished my instruction by teaching me that you are God, and that everything is God.' As early as four centuries before this time, Bajezid of Bestami, the founder of the Bestamis, had exclaimed in the presence of his disciples, alluding to his own person: 'Glory to myself; I am above everything!'—a mode of expression which, in the language of the Orientals, is applied to the Deity alone. By degrees the worship of their master superseded, among the Dervishes, the worship of God; the aim of life was no longer directed to an intimate union of the soul with its Creator, but to an absolute conformity with the thoughts of the sheikh. 'Whatever you do or think, let your sheikh be always present to your minds:' such is the first and almost the only obligation imposed on the Dervish, and expressed by a kind of mental prayer, named *rabouta*, which these fanatics are as scrupulous in repeating as other Mussulmans their Namaz.

"These doctrines produced their fruits in a host of half religious, half political devotees, who styled themselves, according to places and circumstances, the *red*, the *white*, the *masked* (borkai), the *familiars* (batheni), the *allegorists*, or *interpreters* (mutervil), *Karmathians*, *Ismailians*, &c., whose traces from the second to the seventh centuries of the Hegira, are marked by blood and ruin. The orthodox classed them under the generic appellation of *moulhad* (wretches), or of *sindik* (freethinkers, sceptics). The most renowned were the Is-

mailians or Assassins, who originally came from Persia, and a few of whom still remain in the mountains above Tripoli and Tortosa.* Persia was, in fact, the stronghold of Dervishism, either from the leaning to mysticism natural to its people, or the Schiite doctrine, which teaches the belief in a hidden Imaum, whose appearance, like that of the Messiah of the Jews, is always expected; both these circumstances contributing to favour the ambition and the impostures of sectaries."

The fakirs of India and the Dervishes of Turkey were alike addicted to mysticism and superstitious practices, intended to produce physical conditions in which trances, and visions, and aberrations of the mind, and concentration on God's attributes of all the faculties of the soul were the supposed result: a firm conviction that the spirit of man, thus separated from its surrounding impediments of worldly cares and sensual indulgences, might ascend to the enjoyment and vision of God. It is singular enough to find Greek monks, in the monasteries of Mount Athos, who flourished in the eleventh century, practising certain formulæ prescribed by their abbot consisting of seclusion, silence, elevation of the mind above all earthly things vain and transitory, turning inwardly all thoughts, and fixing the eyes immovably on the region of the mediastinum. "And then (says the Abbot to his disciples) all will at first be dark and dreary; but if you persevere day and night you will feel an ineffable joy, and no sooner has the soul discovered the place of the heart, than it is involved in a mystic and ethereal light."†

* Haschischin, *i.e.*, eaters of haschis, a name corrupted by us into assassins. These are the sectaries whose chief is mentioned by William of Tyre, and in the histories of the Crusaders, under the name of the old man of the mountains. They were destroyed A.D. 1253 by Houlagou, the leader of the great Mogul invasion, and by Bibars, Sultan of Egypt. See Von Hammer's excellent history of the order of Assassins, and "Lettres sur la Turquie," par M. Ubicini. Sylvestre de Sacy says—"I am led to believe, that among the Ismailites, those only were termed *Hashishin*, who were specially educated to commit murder, and who were, by the use of the *Hashish*, disposed to an absolute resignation to the will of their chief; this, however, may not have prevented the denomination from being applied to Ismailites collectively, especially among the Occidentals."

† Gibbon's Rise and Fall, vol. vii. p. 106.

The Persian Poets of celebrity, and the most eminent of them, Saadi and Hafiz, were Sofi's in their philosophical and religious principles. Many of them were secretly affiliated with orders of dervishes, some of them were publicly known to be of that order. The Gulistan of Saadi abounds with instruction for Dervishes. He inculcates, however, sincerity of religious life and belief, and distinguishes between genuine spirituality and mere asceticism, professions of poverty, exhibitions of mortification, an affected contempt for the decencies of life, cleanliness and courtesy. He recommends the man who would be a devotee in good earnest, to avoid above all things being a hypocrite : " Possess the virtues of a true Dervish, and then you may wear, if you like, a Tartar felt instead of a cloth cap."

The great influence gained by the dervishes, in the year 1501, A.D., was manifested in the elevation to the throne of Persia, of a dervish named Shah Ismail Sefervi, who pretended to be descended from Moussa, the seventh revealed Imaum. This successful imposter was the founder of a dynasty of princes, known in history as Saphis.

" It was not (says Gibbon) till the fourth century (of the Hegira) that the religion of Mohammed had been corrupted by an institution (that of the Dervishes) but in the age of the Crusades the various orders of Dervishes were multiplied by the examples of the Christians, and even the Latin monks. The lords of nations submitted to fast and pray, and turned round in endless rotations with the fanatics who mistook the giddiness of the head for the illumination of the spirit."*

We find the greatest and the best of the Turkish Sultans, Amurath II., in the midst of his great triumphs and victories, in Syria and Asia Minor, Thrace and Roumania, in the middle of the fifteenth century, at the age of forty, abdicating the Turkish throne, and retiring to Magnesia, to enjoy the society of Saints and Santons, who flourished there under the name of Dervishes.

* Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Ed. 1855, vol. vii. p. 267.

Charles V. was not without a precedent and example, when he abandoned his Empire for companionship with monks. The first connection of the Dervishes with the Turkish state, that we find notice of in history, was in the time of Amurath I., when he determined on recruiting his armies with Christian slaves, captured by his soldiers at Gallipoli, and the new militia thus established, composed of the young *élite* of the Greek captives, duly educated in arms and religion, was consecrated and trained by a celebrated Dervish, a venerable sheikh named Hadji Bektak, the founder of the Bektak Dervishes. Gibbon has described the origin and decline of the famous military institution of the Janissaries.*

The influence of the Dervishes over the Janissaries, from that time to the day of their destruction, never ceased. It existed during a period of upwards of four centuries and a half.

And it is a fact worthy of notice that when Sultan Mahmoud, of reforming, if not of blessed memory, determined on the destruction of the Janissaries, that of the different orders of the Dervishes in Stamboul, was meditated as a necessary result of the other strong measure of a massacre, to put down fanaticism in military array.

Sultan Mahmoud had discovered, like several of his predecessors, and not a few of the caliphs, that Dervishism had gained a dangerous influence over their subjects, and especially over the most brutal, ignorant, and fanatical portion. Many fruitless efforts were made to restrain that influence, and the secular ecclesiastical functionaries (of the Ulema, if the latter may be so designated), lent their willing assistance to the sovereign power to bring their monastic brethren to ruin, on the plea, or rather the pretence, of defending the pure orthodox

" Their valour has declined, their discipline is relaxed, and their tumultuary array is incapable of contending with the order and weapons of modern tactics; but at the time of their institution, they possessed a decisive superiority in war; since a regular body of infantry, in constant exercise and pay, was not maintained by any of the princes of Christendom. The Janizaries fought with the zeal of proselytes against their idolatrous countrymen; and in the battle of Cassara, the league and independence of the Sclavonian tribes was finally crushed."—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. vii., p. 149.

faith of Islam from the impieties in public, and the irregularities and immoralities of the Dervishes in their Tekiehs or convents. The interests of religion and the sovereign are always found in danger, and declared to be in a state requiring to be defended, when the interests of the mosque or the church, in the persons of the ministers of either, are in even imaginary risk.

The Ulemas devised an ingenious plan to bring their Dervish rivals and adversaries into odium and discredit with the people. They represented the latter as infidels and sectaries, as Schiites of the heterodox followers of Ali, as enemies of the prophet and the sultan, as sons of perdition, as children of the Shitan. This is always a fine stroke of polemical warfare, to bedevil an adversary's doctrines, to make him out an agent of diabolical wickedness, to assign the devil to him for a father, and to consign him, when he is dead, to the same unhallowed parent.

In 1656, the Sultan, through his grand vizier, Mohammed Kiupruli, made an effort to annihilate four orders of Dervishes —namely, the Mevlevi, Khalweti, Djelveti, and Chemsi. This summary effort of supreme authority could not be productive of any permanent advantage; the Janissaries, whose institution their predecessors had baptised, were in being, able and willing to protect them.

Sultan Mahmoud II. thought he would avoid the error of his predecessor, by getting rid of the two great impediments to his plans of reform. He had the Janissaries massacred at the Atmeidan, on the 15th of June, 1826, and on the 10th of July, the same year, he took advantage of some tumults that had ensued in the capital after the massacre of the Janissaries, in which the Bektaki Dervishes were said to have assisted, to get rid of the order, which, strange to say, was the one founded by that Dervish, by whom the Janissary institution had been consecrated and named.

In this age of philosophy that devotes its wisdom to the science of political economy, and all arts that conduce to the advantage of material interests and mechanical appliances, and

inventions; when Christianity, in some of the most civilised or commercial nations of the earth, is a name and a mask, and not an entity or an element; when it is thought necessary for every gentleman who moves in good society, for every lady of rank or respectability, who brings up a family, "in a proper manner," for every statesman, and member of the legislature, who has to consult the feelings or prejudices of a party or a constituency, for every editor of a literary or political periodical, who has a character for decency and decorum, to exhibit some regard for the Church that is the wife or mistress of the State, it may be considered superstitious to see the hand of God in signal chastisements that have fallen on men or institutions that have been instrumental to great outrages on humanity, or impiety against God.

Perhaps I should say it was a curious coincidence, that a man of religion, the founder of a sect, should have prostituted his sacred function, by calling down the blessing of heaven on that terribly iniquitous institution (the Janissaries), consisting of Christian captives, children of Greek parents, stolen for the express purpose of robbing them of their faith, and then training them into soldiers to cut the throats of their own countrymen, friends, and relatives, as they had done with such terrible fury and ferocity at the siege of Constantinople; and that the followers of the very sect, by which the Janissary institution was consecrated, should be doomed to the same destruction which had fallen within a month on the Janissaries, over the cradle of whose institution their founder had prayed and poured forth benedictions.

On the 10th of July, 1826, Sultan Mahmoud put his hand to the first measure of ecclesiastical reform. He massacred the three chiefs of the Betacki Dervishes, in Stamboul, abolished the whole order of Betacki, razed their Tekiehs—convents—to the ground, exiled most of the Dervishes of Stamboul, prohibited those who were suffered to remain, from assuming their distinctive dress. The Mufti and Ulemas are said to have concurred in this measure, nay, more, to have advised it. This is very improbable;

there is good reason to believe, however inimical they were to the Dervishes, the Mufti and Ulemas were, at that period, still more inimical to the Sultan and his reforming ministers.

Dervishes of all orders, the most mystic and ascetic, the most renowned for spirituality and sanctity, the whirling, howling, and dancing Dervishes, were greatly shocked and astounded at this blow on the sacred heads of their most august order. They believed the heavens were about to fall on their own Tekiehs. Their own sheiks were in daily expectation of being bow-strung. We are told they were so astounded at the sacrilegiousness of the Sultan, that they thought the world was coming to an end, and declared that Mahmoud was a murderer of his most faithful children,—that he had become a giaour, an upstart, and an infidel. And so lost in amazement, were those pre-eminently saintly and spiritualized men, that finally, we are told, they uttered no more prayers or curses, they remained wrapt in sorrowful meditation, quite mute and motionless,—"*devoured by anguish, and with their backs resting against the wall of stupefaction.*"

The jolly beggars of the Moslem mendicant order, with whose rolicking, raki drinking, frolic and fun, and good living propensities, in their days of prosperity, in private circles, when the cowl of the Dervish was laid aside, when the saintly men were not in the spiritual condition, in one sense at least—of whom I have a very lively, and not a disagreeable recollection —I can hardly think of under any misfortunes, or in any untoward circumstances, "devoured by anguish, and with their back resting on the wall of stupefaction."

But the recuperative energies of the Dervishes were soon manifested in the renewed vitality, rude health, and even insolent vigour of their institution.

The Sultan Mahmoud, who quailed not before the military power of the Janissaries, was frightened by the monastic intrigues, active opposition, and popular influence of the Dervishes. He struck one blow at them, and then his heart failed, and his hand was withheld from them.

The Dervishes, to the great surprise of the Franks of Stamboul, and disgust of the diplomatists, who were driving on the Sultan to make reforms and remove opposition to them, in a very short time resumed all their former sanctimony, and its accompanying insolence, and were considered by well informed people, as the mainsprings and secret authors of an agitation created and carried on in an underhand manner among the population of Stamboul, and the people of some of the chief towns in the provinces.

In 1837 Sultan Mahmoud II. nearly fell a victim to their fanaticism and resentment. As he was crossing the bridge of Galata, surrounded by his guards, a Dervish known by the name of Sheik Satchlu (the hairy), whom the common people reverenced as a saint, rushed before his horse, exclaiming with fury, "Ghiaour Padishah! (infidel sovereign) art thou not satiated with abominations? thou shalt be responsible to Allah for thy impiety. Thou destroyest the institutions of thy brethren; thou ruinest Islam, and thou drawest down the wrath of the prophet on thyself and thy people." The sultan, who feared the effect of such a scene upon the people, commanded his officers to remove this madman from the path. "Mad!" replied the Dervish indignantly, "I mad! it is thou and thy base councillors who have lost your reason; crowd hither, O, Mussulmans! the spirit of God which animates me, and which I am forced to obey, hath ordered me to speak the truth, and hath promised me the reward of the saints."

He was arrested and put to death. His brethren claimed his body, which was given up to them. The following day a rumour prevailed in the city, that a brilliant light had appeared throughout the night over the tomb of the martyr.

"It is by means of such pretended miracles, which are repeated every day, even under the eyes of the authorities, that the Dervishes keep up the old superstitions in men's minds, together with a belief in their supernatural power. . . .

"Very lately a Dervish of Bokhara (who exceed all others in fanaticism), presented himself to the audience of Reschid Pasha,

and there publicly, and before the whole Porte, loaded the minister with insults and threats, styling him a dog, an infidel, and a miscreant, calling down the thunders of heaven, and the daggers of all true Mussulmans, to smite him. The vizier, to prevent the revolt which began to threaten, was obliged to rest satisfied with ordering the man to be turned out by the kavasses, almost politely, as if he were a poor devil who had lost his senses."*

There are two classes of persons in Turkey, who bring more discredit on the Dervishes than their own shortcomings of a religious nature might justly occasion. Impostors who have never been in Tekiehs except as servants, assuming the habit of Dervishes, of dissolute lives in private, great devotees in public, affecting to be saints, but very lax in their religious opinions in relation to the law of Islam and the prophet; and roving Dervishes, nicknamed Sereacks, who originally belonged to the institution, and had been employed to go from place to place, to beg for the Tekiehs of the mendicant order of Kalenders, and had ceased to be connected with them, or had been expelled from other orders, on account of their disorders; and make a living as equivocal devotees, half saints, half jugglers, in reality being whole knaves and vagabonds.

These persons have no influence over the people whom they cajole; but the true dervishes have a vast deal of influence not only in the provinces, but in the capital, and M. Ubicini, the most able, and best informed of all the modern advocates of the new Turkish reforms, writing so lately as 1853, of Turkey and its Resources, &c., says he was greatly struck with an observation of an Osmanli functionary of State holding a high post in Constantinople, respecting the Dervishes.

"The thing that ruins us is want of faith in our work (of reform). Hence some become dispirited, and sink into inertness, whilst others are so hasty that they establish nothing durably. It is said that God is patient because he is eternal.

* Lettres sur la Turquie, par M. Ubicini.

As for us we are impatient because we have but a few hours to live, and we feel eternity escaping from our grasp."

M. Ubicini thinks that the new reforms will finally overcome the principal difficulties that are now besetting the Turkish Empire, and especially occasioned by the old prejudices of the Ulemas, but which he thinks are already beginning to give way; the Ulemas, he says, may be attached to the reforming government, at the sacrifice of a portion of their privileges and interests. "*But such a result*," he adds, "*will never be arrived at by the Dervishes, who are engaged in a mortal combat with the ruling powers.*"

CHAPTER XIII.

The Institution of the Janissaries. 1330—1826.

THE institution of the Janissaries, destined to be for centuries the scourge of the Christians of the East, and the terror of the Princes of the West, owes its origin to Emir Orchan, the second sovereign of the Ottoman Empire, and not to Amurath, the first, as Knolles erroneously asserts.

Knolles, in his life of Sultan Amurath I. (vol. i., p. 132.), says, "that by the command of Amurath, and at the suggestion of a certain Ulema, named Cara (or Black) Rustemes, a decree was made, and with all due formalities promulgated, emanating from the cadileskeer, or chief judge, named Chelil Kinderlu, ordaining that every fifth captive of the Christians, above fifteen years, should be devoted to the service of the prince, as by divine right allotted to him. If the number of captives were under five, then the vanquished were to pay to the prince, for every head, twenty-five aspers, by way of tribute. It was ordained also, that officers should be appointed for collecting such captives, and poll tribute, and that the chief collecting officer, should be Rustemes, as the first proposer and deviser of this measure."

"By which means (says Knolles) great numbers of Christian youths were brought to the court (of Amurath I.) as the king's captives, which, by counsel of Kinderlu Chelil, then chief judge,

were distributed among the Turkish husbandmen in Asia, there to learn the Turkish language, religion, and manners."

And after being so educated for two or three years, they were brought to the court at Brusa, and the better sort of them were chosen to attend on the prince, and to serve him in his wars. After due instruction in martial exercises, and feats of agility, they were drafted into a corps called Janizars, or new soldiers.*

The Prince Cantemir seems to adopt the erroneous notion of the Janissary institution originating with Amurath I., when he says :—

"Amurath I. had formed them into a body, he sent them to Haji Bektash, a Turkish saint, famous for his miracles and prophecies, desiring him to give them a banner, to pray to God for their success, and to give them a name. The saint, when they appeared in his presence, put the sleeves of his gown upon one of their heads, and says, 'Let them be called Yengicheri. Let their countenance be ever bright, their hands victorious, their sword keen, let their spear always hang over the heads of their enemies, and wherever they go, may they return with a shining face.'"

Von Hammer, in his Turkish History, Books 3—4, shows that the project of composing an army of Christian children, captured in war, and compelled to adopt the religion of their captors, originated with an adviser of Sultan Orchan, and connected by marriage with him, named Khalil Iskandereli, commonly called Black Khalil.

Khalil reasoned thus with the Sultan—"The conquered are the property of the conqueror, who is the lawful master of them, and of their lands, their goods, their wives and their children. We have a right to do what we like with our own; and the treatment which I propose, is not only lawful but benevolent. By enforcing the conversion of these captive children to the true faith, and enrolling them in the ranks of the army of true be-

* Knolles' Turkish History, vol. i. p. 132.

lievers, we consult both their temporal and their eternal interests, for is it not written in the Koran, that all children at their birth are naturally disposed to Islamism?"

It is very evident that the persons described as the originators of the project of the Janissary institution, by Knolles and Von Hammer, by the former as an Ulema, named Cara Kustemes, with the sanction of a chief judge, Cadileskeer, named Kinderlu Chelil, and by the latter, Von Hammer, as Kara Khalil Iskandereli, are in reality to be designated and known by the same name, and that the project of the individual thus referred to, which is said by Knolles to have been made to Amurath I., was made to Orchan, and adopted by him.

It is equally certain it was in Orchan's time that a standing army, small indeed, in point of number, but still of vast importance at that period in its influences on the fortune of the young empire of the Turks, was provided for, and set on foot, a century before the first standing army of Europe, that of Charles VII. of France, was established.

Orchan's predecessors had made war with volunteer bands, and vassals of their own tribes, who collected round the flag of their chief, when a *raide* or *razee* was determined on, and these swarms of armed men dispersed when the particular service was over for which they had flocked to the standard of their prince.

Orchan's vizier and brother Aladin organised a corps of permanent infantry, to be paid a fixed sum, and this corps was called Yada, or Piade. The high pay given to this force, and the great favour shewn to it by the sultan and his vizier, soon led to insolence and insubordination in this pet corps, and we are told that their pride and turbulence rendered the soldiers of this new force formidable to the government. Orchan took counsel with his vizier, and the legal functionary named Khalil Ischendereli, or Chelil Kinderlu, and on some Turkish principle similar to the Italian one "Che un diavolo scaccia l'altro," determined to create a new military force to control and check the other. And thus Black Khalil's nefarious and diabolical pro-

ject, the Janissary institution, came into being. Khalil was a man of the law, and consequently of the religion of Islam. It, therefore, was natural, or, at least, professional for him to surround a project that had the grim aspect of murder and rapine in it, with the sweet odour of Turkish sanctity.

It was therefore on polemical grounds this old legal functionary, true to the interests of his order, and obedient to those instincts by which strong tyranny and rapacity are always prompted to seek a subterfuge in religion for a sanction for their crimes, urged his atrocious project, and successfully pleaded for its adoption.

The execution of this terrible scheme must have fallen on the vanquished Christian populations of Orchan's territories in Asia Minor, in Thrace, and Annatolia, like a thunderbolt.

It is impossible to exaggerate the consternation it must have occasioned in all the unfortunate Greek families in those regions where the new tax on flesh and blood, on families, the nearest and the dearest ties of which were to be severed by it. Let us, for a moment, imagine ourselves in their position—let us fancy we are the heads of a single family of these vanquished Christians, who had become tributaries to Sultan Orchan, and been allowed to live, reconciled, in some degree to their unhappy state, when suddenly the collectors of the new impost make their appearance, and demand the quota of our children over the age of fifteen, to make soldiers for the sultan, to be converted to the religion of Mohammed, to be made fit to fight for it against the Giaours who are of our own kith and kin, race and creed, who, at a glance, we see are to be not only torn from our arms, but turned against the name of Christ, made haters of our holy religion, of ourselves, of every one belonging to us, and of everything that is dear to us!

Let me ask Christian parents of any church whose members believe in Christ, what would their feelings then be? Let me ask the eulogists of Turkey, and the champions of its institutions, literary, polemical, and parliamentary, what feelings, except those of hostility to Christianity, and all civilisation that

is based on it, would not be horrified at the recital of those diabolical razees, of periodical occurrence year after year for a period of three hundred years, with its annual enrolment of 1,000 Christian children in the corps of the Janissaries, making, on the lowest estimate, the number of 300,000 Greek Christians, converted into Mohammedan Turkish soldiers.

Von Hammer calculates the numbers, and describes them as a multitude of 500,000 young Christians, first made the victims then the ministers of Mohammedan power and brutality! Oh, tolerant religion of Mohammed, what crimes have not been committed in thy name!

There is much justice in the following observation of Professor Creasy, on this subject:—"Cut off from all ties of country, kith, and kin, but with high pay and privileges, with ample opportunities for military advancement, and for the gratification of the violent, the sensual, and the sordid passions of their animal natures, amid the customary atrocities of successful warfare, this military brotherhood grew up to be the strongest and fiercest instrument of imperial ambition, which remorseless fanaticism, prompted by the most subtle statecraft, ever devised upon earth."*

What blasphemy and hypocrisy have not been practised in the perpetration of those crimes of Turkish rule in former ages? What powers of intellect and principles of polity and religion in our own times, have not been perverted and abused by Christians—by men of letters, by statesmen, and even divines, in their vindication of Turkish rule and religion, and their assertion of the tolerant character of that most brutal and sanguinary, as well as insolent and ruthless, of all fanaticisms.

The first levy made by Orchan on the vanquished Christians of his territories, comprised a thousand of their finest children. The second, the year following, was to a similar amount, and so continued, it is said by Professor Creasy, to the same extent for a period of three hundred years, to the year 1648, in the reign of

* History of the Ottoman Turks, vol. i. p. 23.

Sultan Mohammed I., when the number of boys captured in war did not come up to the required amount, and was completed by a levy on the families of the Christian subjects of the Sultan. We are further told this system of recruiting for the Janissary institution was changed in the time of Mohammed IV., which was to be thenceforth recruited from among the children of the Janissaries and native Turks.*

Now, this mode of stating the annual seizures of Christian children from the time of Orchan, is not correct, except in the particular of the fixed annual number of 1,000 children, required for the sultan's service. A portion of these, it will be found by Knolles, were selected on the first occasion of the levy being made for attendance on the Sultan. The few words employed in this brief statement, are calculated to give a new horror to the list of evils of the direst description, which the parents of those unfortunate children had to dread, or rather to mourn over as ills inseparable from the destinies of those poor lost children.

Professor Creasy has been led into an erroneous view of this subject of providing recruits for the Janissary corps, by capturing Greek children, and training those children taken in war, as soldiers for the sultan. I attribute this error to the plan on which his work (exceedingly useful, notwithstanding some erroneous views) has been written. His materials, he says in the title are chiefly taken from Von Hammer, or, to use his own words, his "History of the Ottoman Turks, is chiefly founded on Von Hammer."

I venture to affirm no independent historical work, can or ought to be founded chiefly on any one preceding history, however eminent the author of it may be. It is only by reading all works of known merit or reputation on a particular subject, not only of an early date, but of later times, that we are enabled to detect errors in dates, names, and relations of events, to throw light on matters that lie in obscurity and confusion and to

* Professor Creasy's "History of the Ottoman Turks," &c., chiefly founded on Von Hammer. Lon. 8vo. 1851. vol. i. p. 22.

supply deficiencies in one work, on some particular subject from redundant information on it that we may find in another.

We find Professor Creasy fixes the date when a change was made in the mode of recruiting the Janissary corps, at 1648, in the reign of Mohammed I., in consequence of the prescribed number of Christians captured in that year's campaign, not amounting to a sufficient number of serviceable boys; so that it became necessary to complete the number by a levy on the families of the Christian subjects of the Sultan.

And then he goes on to state that it was in the time of Mohammed IV. that the practice ceased altogether of recruiting this force by forced levies of Christian children.

Professor Creasy evidently is of opinion that the levying of this impost of Christian children on the families of the vanquished Greeks, was only an occasional adjunct to the scheme of providing recruits by means of captives taken in war. It is very evident from the terms of the original project, which I have quoted from Knolles, that the great idea of the originator was that the Mohammedan ruler of the State was authorised by the Koran, to levy an annual tax on his vanquished Christian subjects, over and above the poll tax fixed at the time of their capture, to be paid in children, and also, when wars were made and conquest followed, that a certain proportion of the captive children (fixed by a canon of the Koran, which accords a fifth part of all spoil to the prophet) should be allotted to the sultan for the service of the State.

It is quite clear that during Orchan's long reign there were a great many years in which no wars were waged; and it is equally certain that the carrying off the Christian children of the Greek rajahs, in the annual levies made to recruit the Janissary force, never ceased for three hundred years. Nay more, at various periods we find the annual levies had been largely increased in amount. Knolles expressly states, that in the time of Amurath IV. the increase had been enormous.

In the year 1656 the suppression was determined of that terrible impost on flesh and blood, which had been inflicted on

the Christians of the empire ever since the conquest—the tax of one fifth of the male children, which the Porte levied every year on all Christian families, throughout the Turkish dominions, to recruit the *Ortas* of the Janissaries.

These Ortas were originally formed of Christian children, who had been carried off in the wars with the Greek empire, or captured in the different European cities taken by the Turks. These captured Christian children received an education adapted to the military calling to which they were destined. When Turkish power declined in Europe, and their marauding expeditions became less frequent and successful, the sultan had to adopt other means to supply the Ortas with Janissaries, and in 1656, when it was found impossible any longer to carry on the old system, either of making wars to procure captives, or robbing families of children to make soldiers, a proceeding attended with constant tumults, revolts, and insurrections, this tax was entirely abolished, a few years later than 1656, and the ranks of the Janissaries were replenished by Asiatic Turks. The last levy made on the Christians was in 1675.

Professor Creasy gives the following account of the first vital change in the organisation of the Janissary institution:

"In 1675 in the vizierate of Ahmet Kupruli, the final levy of three thousand boys for recruiting the Turkish army, was made on the Christian population of the Ottoman Empire in Europe. The old system of filling the ranks of the Janissaries exclusively with compulsory conscripts and converts from among the children of the rajahs, had been less and less rigidly enforced since the time of Amurath IV. Admission into the corps of the Janissaries, now conferred many civil as well as military advantages; so that it was eagerly sought by men who were of Turkish origin, and born to the Mohammedan faith. The first measure of relaxation of the old rule was to treat those who were the children of Janissaries, as eligible candidates for enrolment. Other Mussulman volunteers were soon received; and the levies of the tribute of children from the Christians grew less frequent and less severe; though they were still occasion-

ally resorted to, in order to supply the thousands of pages, who were required to people the vast chambers of the Serail, and who were, in case of emergency drafted into the army of the State.

"But ever since the year 1675, the rajahs of the empire have been entirely free from the terrible tax of flesh and blood, by which the Ottoman military force was sustained during its early centuries of conquest. With this change in the constitution of the corps of Janissaries, the numbers of that force were greatly increased; large bodies of them were now settled with their families in the chief cities of the empire, where they engaged in different trades and occupations. The exclusively monastic and martial character of the new soldiery of Hadji Beytash had long ago disappeared."*

So that the institution which sprung up in the time of Orchan, probably about twenty years before his death (which took place in 1359), say about 1339, continued in force till the year 1675; for a term of 336 years, and the number of Christian children, at the lowest estimate, carried off from their parents, or captured in war every year was 1,000. This would give a total of 336,000 captured and Mohammedanized Christian children. But Von Hammer estimates the number at nearly one-third more.

The number of this corps at the commencement of the institution, was not considerable, but in the time of Amurath II. it received encouragement, and rapidly augmented. Under Solyman, in the year 1521, says Marsigli (ætat. &c. p. 68), it amounted to twelve thousand, but since that time the numbers have greatly increased. Early European writers on Turkey saw very clearly the dangers that beset the empire at the hands of this turbulent soldiery, who, like the prætorian guards of Rome, in its worst age, made and unmade, exalted and deposed princes, patronised and murdered consuls and governors.

Nicolas Daulphinois, who accompanied M. D'Aramon, am-

* Creasy—History of the Ottoman Turks, vol. ii. p. 64.

bassador from Henry II. of France, to Solyman, published an account of his travels, in which he describes and celebrates the discipline of the Janissaries, but at the same time predicts that they would one day become formidable to their masters, and act the same part at Constantinople as the Prætorian bands had done at Rome. "Collection of Voyages from the Earl of Oxford's Library, vol. i. p. 599."

It has been erroneously supposed that the creation of a standing army, in Turkey, and the grants of lands to certain descriptions of soldiers, coupled with feudal obligations, those military fiefs called Timariots and Ziams, which have been abolished of late years, and the public debt charged with the indemnity of the surviving claimants, originated with Sultan Solyman, whereas the origin of them in reality dates from the time of Orchan. Robertson, in his "History of Charles V.," says :—

"Solyman the magnificent, to whom the Turkish historians have given the surname of Canuni, or instituter of rules, first brought the finances and military establishment of the Turkish Empire into a regular form. He divided the military force into the Capiculy, or soldiery of the Porte, which was properly, the standing army, and the Serrataculy, or soldiers appointed to guard the frontiers. The chief strength of the latter consisted of those who held Timariots and Ziams. These were portions of land granted to certain persons for life, in much the same manner as the military fiefs among the nations of Europe, in return for which military service was performed. Solyman, in his Canum Namé, or book of regulations, fixed with great accuracy, the extent of these lands in each province of his empire, appointed the precise number of soldiers each person who held a Timariot or a Ziam should bring into the field, and established the pay which they should receive while engaged in service. Count Marsigli, and Sir Paul Rycaut have given extracts from this book of regulations, and it appears that the ordinary establishment of the Turkish army exceeded 150,000 men. When these are added to the soldiery of the Porte, they

formed a military power which vastly exceeded what any Christian state could command. Marsigli, Etat. Militaire, &c. p. 136. Rycaut's State of the Ottoman Empire, book iii. ch. 2.

As Solyman, during his active reign, was engaged so constantly in war, that his troops were always in the field, the Serrataculy became almost equal to the Janissaries themselves in discipline and valour."*

M. de Peysonnel says that the enrolled Janissaries were so numerous as to amount to several millions; nevertheless, they were only estimated at 40,000; on which account they were called the Forty Thousand Slaves; and though there might have been 400,000 on the pay list, it is certain the treasury did not issue pay for more than 40,000, that being only received by the Janissaries of the "odas," or barracks at Constantinople, and those who in the garrisons followed their "kettle." All those who were not with the standard were called "Yamahs," and received no emolument.

The Janissaries and the Spahis, who were the flower of the Turkish army, never exceeded in number more than 100,000 effective men, while the number of Janissaries actually employed varied from 40,000 to 50,000; these corps were generally scattered in different points, making each but a small portion of the army.

The principal part of the Turkish armies were levied on the same plan as those in the feudal ages. The Spahis, the most distinguished cavalry regiments, were rewarded with rich tracts of land; and besides these were the wild hordes from Asia, the Bashi Bazouks, who seem to have been something like our "free lances," with many other corps differing in arrangement and efficiency; and as the great bulk of the army of Turkey served without remuneration, simply being exempted from taxation, these soldiers were regarded by the Janissaries as merely instrumental in protecting themselves from the enemy's fire, or to fill up the trenches.

* Robertson's "History of Charles V." vol. ii. proofs and illustrated.

The Rev. Mr. Christmas, a zealous defender of Turkey and all its institutions, in his Life of Sultan Abdul 'Medjid, observes:

"One obvious element of defence for the Ottoman empire was neutralized, if not rendered positively noxious, by that old Mussulman fanaticism, which it was Mahmoud's incessant endeavour to eradicate, or at least abate—we allude to the exclusion of the Christian population of Turkey from the Ottoman army. The four principal stocks inhabiting European Turkey are the Osmanlis, the Greeks, the Roumanians of Wallachia and Moldavia, and the Sclavonians. Of these, the Osmanlis amount to about 1,100,000, the Greeks to 1,000,000, the Roumanians to 4,000,000, and the Sclavonians alone to nearly eight or nine millions. Upon the attitude of this latter race, let it be observed in passing, depends, in a great measure, the future condition of the Ottoman empire and the world. This warlike race, however were scarcely regarded by the early Mussulmans in the light of defenders of the Ottoman throne; they were more frequently watched as its nearest foes. A more enlightened view of his Christian subjects was taken by Mahmoud and his successor, but owing to one obstructive cause or other, the amalgamation of Christians in the Ottoman army has only practically, and to any considerable extent, taken place within the last year."

The Janissaries and the Piade composed the chief infantry of Orchan. The cavalry of the new organisation, permanently embodied, and having a fixed pay, were organised after the manner of the mounted squadrons of the Caliph Omar, as guards of the sacred standard. They numbered, in Orchan's time only 2,400, but in that of Solyman, the magnificent, four thousand. Their great privilege was to go into battle on the right and left of the Sultan. One corps of these imperial guards was called Spahis, or select horsemen, another Silikdars, or vassal cavalry.

The vizier Aladdin had organized another force of mounted soldiers, to whom grants of land were given, similar to those

conferred on the infantry, Piade. They were exempted from taxes, and were therefore called Moselliman, or "tax free." These last were commanded by Sanjak Beys, chiefs of standards, by Binbaschi, or colonels, chiefs of thousands, and by Soubaschi captains, chiefs of hundreds.

There were other holders in the time of Orchan of military fiefs, great and little, called Tiamets and Timars.

Sultan Amurath I., who succeeded to the Ottoman crown in 1359, greatly increased, and regularly organized the Janissary institution, formed by his predecessor, Orchan, in whose time their numbers amounted only to 12,000. In Amurath's reign they must have been nearly trebled, for in the early part of the reign of his successor, Bajazet, we find they amounted to forty thousand.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Janissary institution, was an overgrown, unwieldy, unmanageable, unsoldierly, military association, very formidable to the government, a terror to the Christian subjects of the Sultan, formidable to all except the enemy.

The new military force of Sultan Selim III., called Nizam Djedid, was at first limited to 12,000 men, in deference to the feelings, or rather in dread of the furious hostility of the Janissaries. The barracks for them were prudently erected on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. The more the new force, whenever it was on service, was successful, as, for instance, against the banditti infesting Bulgaria and Roumelia, &c., the more the rage of the Janissaries was augmented. But their exasperation was at its height, when the Sultan issued a decree, in 1805, for drafting young soldiers from the Janissary force into the new body of Nizam Djedid, thus intimating an intention to recruit the latter force henceforward from the Janissaries, and a design of gradually breaking up the latter by the system of recruiting for the new one. The Janissaries were now as stupidly besotted as they were brutal and ferocious, whenever their own interests were concerned, in any controversy in which they were engaged with the State.

These controversies are of an old date. It is not in the present century, nor even in the past, that we must look for the formidable and sacred soup-kettle of the Janissaries being dragged forth from their barracks, and overturned in the Atmeidan, in the face of vast multitudes of Osmanlis, and in the midst of howlings and screamings, and pistol shooting in the air, and the yelping of innumerable dogs, hideous and revolting to look on, as the Janissaries themselves, round whose barracks these great lazy, loathsome, ferocious, greedy animals habitually congregated. I write from personal experience of this subject, and more than once or twice, nay, on several occasions, I have had these half-famished, brute allies of the Janissaries, savagely and wantonly set on me; on some occasions, to which I have alluded in my Eastern travels, to the imminent danger of my life. It would have afforded amusement to have seen a Christian torn to pieces, limb by limb, by these ferocious dogs.

Selim was never destined to be long in the enjoyment of peace in any part of his dominions. The Wahabites made predatory attacks on Syria, renewed them, and overran all Arabia. In 1802 they captured Mecca and Medina. This event produced a panic throughout the Turkish Empire. In all panics in Stamboul, the ridiculously-accoutred, lumbering, and very heavy infantry indeed—the Janissaries—have played a principal part; terrified the peaceful inhabitants and timid authorities (very much in the manner Orangemen act in the north of Ireland) by beating drums, firing shots, and manifesting to an accountable extent a state of ferocious excitement, more like the sudden fury of an access of brain fever, than the temporary phrenzy of drunkenness, or short madness of passion.

The Janissaries held in peculiar veneration a huge copper soup-kettle, which was always dragged out into the court-yard of their barracks when a mutiny was to be made, a revolt to be inaugurated, or dissatisfaction to be proclaimed, the average amount of murder to be committed, and a certain number of houses to be wrecked or burned. The Orangemen have no old

soup kettles to drag into the thoroughfares, and along the public roads when they go out "A Colonelling," for ball exercise on crucifixes, chapel doors and windows, or pouring an occasional volley into a crowd of idolatrous papists of either sex, young or old; but they have huge kettle drums, which serve them as the utensil for soup does the Janissaries, to make *a row.*

In 1807 the Janissaries serving in the Danubian provinces and in garrison in Belgrade commenced a series of acts of turbulence and insubordination, and of sanguinary atrocities, alike terrible to the inhabitants, and the local Turkish authorities.

The Porte proceeded to act vigorously against the ferocious military rabble, but deemed it politic to take off the chief of the Janissaries by assassination before issuing an order for their quitting the Pachalik of Belgrade. The expelled Janissaries immediately joined the forces of the rebel chiefs of Widdin, and invaded Servia. The Servian rajahs rose in great force against the rebels, defeated, and would have entirely destroyed them, but that their faithful friends, the Ulema of Constantinople, came to the rescue of the Moslem soldiers, and got up a cry against the dogs of Christians in Servia, armed against the true believing defenders of Islamism. Once more Sultan Selim's projects of reform were beaten back by the Janissaries and the Ulema.

A person of some celebrity—Busbequius—more than three centuries ago, expressed the following opinions of the Janissaries. He wrote from the Turkish camp, and states that his opinions are those of the general of the great Turkish military force, whose name was then the terror of Europe. In consequence of a dispute between some Janissaries and the people of an ambassador, Busbequius states that the Grand Vizier sent a messenger to him, requesting that he would avoid all occasions of disputes with the Janissaries, whom he describes as the worst of men.

"You know," said the vizier, "it is now a time of war, when they may be said to reign rather than the Sultan, who himself stands in awe of them. The truth is," he continued, "though

there may be some use in them as a standing guard and a militia, yet there are also many inconveniences attending this force, of which this is the chief. Their emperor is very fearful of them, lest, having the sword in their hands, they should alter the government as they please, of which there have been many precedents."

Nearly a century afterwards, Warrington, referring to the same subject, remarks that "the wound in the Turkish monarchy, uncured and incurable, is the power which the Janissaries possess of exciting sedition."

And in the middle of the seventeenth century, the celebrated Turkish minister, Kiuperli, a man of the most enlightened views, is said to have contemplated a war with Germany, and to have enjoined on his son its prosecution, for the express purpose of endeavouring to extirpate the Janissaries in the course of it. Accordingly in 1664, it was arranged that those brave, but unruly soldiers, should be constantly exposed to the greatest dangers in every battle, until the bravest soldiers, and large numbers of their expert captains perished, and great damage was inflicted on the Ottoman power.

In 1807 the Janissaries took advantage of the absence of a portion of the new troops from the capital to make a fresh revolt. On this occasion they were entirely successful. After, as usual, overturning their old soup kettle, slaying a considerable number of the adherents and defenders of the Sultan, burning many houses and terrifying the whole Christian population of the sultan—they deposed Selim, and a little later, in another of their revolts, the unfortunate Sultan was slain.

The main facts of the destruction of the Janissaries by the Sultan Mahmoud, in 1826, are fairly stated by Professor Creasy in his "History of the Ottoman Turks, chiefly founded on Von Hammer," (in two vols. 8vo., Lon., vol. i. p. 4). The numbers, however, of the slain Janissaries, are greatly underrated by him.

"In May, 1826 (says the Rev. R. W. Frazer, in his "History of the Ottoman Empire," Lon. 8vo., 1854, p. 406), the

sultan issued a katti-sheriff for the formation of a new army. Hitherto the Janissaries had been without the slightest suspicion of the intention of their sovereign; but the veil now fell from their eyes. They perceived that the scheme which had cost Selim his throne was about to be revived. They now began to understand why their companions had not returned from Greece, and they perceived that the time was come to make a stand for their privileges; if not even their existence. In less than a fortnight after the proclamation of the new army, the whole of the Janissaries were in open revolt. But the sultan had foreseen the danger of such a crisis, and had prepared for it. The Aga of the Janissaries, without being suspected by those under him, had espoused the cause of the Sultan; all the garrisons of the Bosphorus were on his side, as well as the artillery, and a very considerable force, which he had gradually and quietly matured.

"The insurrection broke out with the utmost fury on the 14th of June, after a grand review of the army had been held, and speedily assumed that desperate character which proved that a decisive crisis had at length arrived. Without attempting to conceal their purpose, the Janissaries gave the signal for revolt, and demanded the execution of the sultan's advisers, and the instant revocation of the offensive edict. The Aga now thought it expedient to throw off the mask he had hitherto worn, and addressing the Janissaries, stigmatised them as rebels and infidels, and called on them to submit to the sultan's authority.

"The discovery that their leader favoured the new project of the sultan, excited the already exasperated soldiery, to the highest pitch of fury. They issued from their barracks fully armed, attacked the palace of the vizier, the admiral of the fleet, and their own commander, the Aga, destroying everything within their reach, and burning several of the buildings to the ground; and the officers, who had thus become the objects of their hatred, only escaped instant death by a precipitate flight. The Aga at once proceeded to the Sultan, and ob-

tained his sanction to an immediate suppression of a revolt which threatened, not only the speedy destruction of the city but his own life.

"By the sultan's order, the famous standard of the prophet, the Sanjak Sheriff, was brought forth with the usual solemn ceremonial; and a proclamation was issued, commanding all faithful Moslems to rally around it, at the same time denouncing the Janissaries as the enemies of religion and the State. This proceeding was successful. A large number of the citizens completely armed, assembled, and at the same time a large force was speedily gathered from the barracks in the neighbourhood of the city, and a park of artillery conveyed from the arsenal at Topkhara.

"The Janissaries had by this time taken up their position in the Atmeidan, a large square in Constantinople, and resolved to defend themselves, little anticipating the real purpose of the Sultan; they expected to obtain by menaces and violence the success their ancestors had often achieved by the same means. The revolters were summoned to lay down their arms, and return to their allegiance; but such was their rage that they put to death the officers who had been sent with the sultan's message. The decisive moment, therefore was arrived. The fetvah of the Muftee was proclaimed, authorising the Sultan to punish the rebels, and a most terrific scene ensued. A battery which had been formed commanding the Atmeidan, opened fire upon the devoted troops, who were mowed down by incessant discharges of grape shot and small arms. A vast number, after resolutely but vainly endeavouring to defend themselves, retired to the barracks, which were immediately set on fire by means of shells thrown into the building, while the gates, by which alone the miserable occupants could escape, were assailed by incessant discharges of grape shot. The barracks were soon enveloped in flames, and all who were not otherwise destroyed, perished in the conflagration. No quarter was given by the sultan. Several colonels, who succeeded in making their way from the scene of destruction, implored mercy on their knees, but were

instantly decapitated. Offers of submission, too, were made by the revolters, in their desperation, but these were disregarded, and the work of extermination proceeded till not one of the Janissaries remained. This terrible slaughter was followed up by measures equally decisive.

"For three months afterwards the Janissaries were everywhere seized and put to death; till, in various parts of the empire, upwards of forty thousand of these troops were annihilated, and an equal number driven into exile. These measures were followed up by a public decree from the highest authority, which declared the very name of the Janissaries to be infamous; their barracks were demolished, their standards were destroyed, and their duties transferred to the new troops, of whom Hussein, the Aga, was appointed commander, and the sultan and his court assumed the military costume of the Egyptians, while the new levies exhibited a dress from which all resemblance to that of the Janissaries was carefully excluded."*

* Turkey, Ancient and Modern; by the Rev. R. W. Fraser, p. 406.

CHAPTER XIV.

Sultan Selim III., and his Reforms.
1789—1807.

SELIM THE THIRD, the predecessor of Sultan Mahmoud, the reformer of abuses, was likewise an originator of reforms, but unfortunately perished in his endeavour to establish his good intentions, at the hands of the Janissaries.

Selim came to the Turkish throne in 1789, perplexed with an inheritance of two wars with Christian powers, Austria and Russia. Early association with a Frank physician had made him well acquainted with European politics, civil institutions, and military tactics. Naturally energetic, enterprising, and intelligent, he ascended the throne with a profound conviction of the degeneracy of the Turkish nation, and a strong sense of the necessity for its renovation. These feelings were strengthened by the signal defeat of the Turkish armies by the Russians and Austrians, in the Danubian provinces, and the capture of Belgrade and Semendria, the first year of his accession.

Peace was made between Austria and Turkey in 1791, but Russia was in no hurry for peace with the holder of the key to her territory; as such Constantinople was considered by Peter the Great; and his august daughter, the Empress Catherine, looked on Constantinople as the prize of the empire, that was to be played for with armies, or diplomacy, as best suited her grand design. When her majesty was pressed by England, and other European powers, to make peace with Turkey, no

solicitations or menaces made an impression. A reply of hers might be considered an avowal of her great purpose of conquest and capture of the capital of Turkey. "And if the western powers were to drive her from St. Petersburg, she would find a capital in Constantinople." Catherine had set Greece in a flame of insurrectionary frenzy, which was in full activity when Selim came to the throne. The Greeks even sent an embassy to Russia to ask the aid of the empress to shake off the Turkish yoke, and the bestowal on their country of a sovereign, in the person of her grandson Constantine. The embassy was graciously received, and the members were introduced to their juvenile sovereign, for as such they saluted him, with the title "Emperor of the Greeks."

The grand project of Russian policy was not sufficiently ripe for accomplishment in 1790. But in that year another heavy blow and great discouragement had Turkey to endure at the hands of Russia—the capture of Ismail by Suwarrow. The slaughter of the Turkish defenders of that town and fortress, and the inhabitants amounted to 33,000 Turks, according to Suwarrow, but according to others, the total number of the slain of all races and creeds was 40,000. This great success was followed by other Russian victories in 1791, one over a Turkish army near Babadagh, and another over a Turkish army of 100,000 men, routed completely by 40,000 Russians.

The evil genius of the Turkish enemy at the court of St. Petersburgh, the arch enemy of its power in Europe, was the Prince Potemkin, the favourite minister of Catherine, the fomenter of every quarrel with the Porte, from the time of Peter the Great. He died in the midst of the triumphs of the Russian armies in Turkey. Perhaps if he had lived five years longer the Ottoman Empire would not have been now in existence. Nay, it might in all probability have been dead and buried, not in oblivion, indeed, but in obloquy for the last sixty years.

When the affairs of Turkey, incidental to this war with Russia, were discussed in the British Parliament, in 1791, Mr.

Fox in reply to Mr. Pitt's arguments for the maintenance of the Turkish empire, and at all sacrifices for upholding its integrity, and thus preserve the balance of power in Europe, said—"The downfall of the Turkish Empire was not an improbable event, and if it happened it would be an advantage."

Mr. Burke said:

"The attempt to bring the Turkish Empire into consideration, when the question of the balance of power in Europe was dealt with, was extremely new, impolitic, and dangerous. . . . We were, it appeared, to plunge ourselves into an immoderate expense, in order to bring Christian nations under the yoke of cruel and inhuman infidels."

In the next session in 1792, Mr. Pitt proclaimed in more explicit terms than he had done before, that *the true doctrine of the balance of power required (English statesmen to believe) that the Russian power should not, if possible, be allowed to increase, nor that of Turkey to decline.*

The significance of that dubious, cautious, misgiving expression—*if possible*—is very noticeable in this programme of British policy, which has now been acted on from the young and palmy days of Mr. Pitt's administration in 1791, to the Palmerston epoch of our war for Turkey with Russia, of the expenditure of our sixty millions sterling, and our many tens of thousands of lives, to carry out Pitt's programme of the preservation of Turkey, and the balance of power in Europe, through it, at all sacrifices.

In January, 1792, by the treaty of Jassy, peace was made between Russia and Turkey, the dominions of Russia being extended to the Dneister. This peace, or rather truce, as it was considered by Russia, was about to come to an end when the Empress Catherine, having made stupendous preparations for a renewal of hostilities with Turkey with a disposable army of 300,000 men ready to march for the Turkish frontiers, died in the midst of her projects and efforts for them in the year 1796.

"The beginning of the end" of the Turkish empire, may be

dated from 1789, when Selim III. commenced his reign. The dominion of the Sultan had already ceased in several provinces, and at the date of the peace at Jassy, January 1792, the rule of Turkey in Hungary, in Transylvania and the Crimea, had ceased. The authority of Sultan Selim was hardly acknowledged in Arabia, except at Mecca and Medina. The Wahabites being in possession of the surrounding country, the Mamelukes were virtually masters of Egypt. In Syria the Druses, and some other tribes, were either in rebellion, or already independent of their local Turkish rulers. The Danubian provinces, though by late arrangements still tributary fiefs of the Sultan, regarded Russia as a prostrate power. In various provinces, and important cities, and fortified places, native tribes, and Turkish pashas, and other authorities were in revolt. This was the case with the Suliotes in Northern Greece and Epirus, with Djezzar in St. Jean d'Acre with the Pacha of Bagdad, the Pachas of Trebizond and Akhalzik, with Passwar Oglou.

The Turkish capital was the head-quarters of governmental corruption, military terrorism and insolence, exercised by the Janissaries far more formidable to the government than its foreign enemies; and, lastly, of popular fanaticism, always at the service and disposal of the chiefs of the religion of the state. In this desperate state of affairs, Sultan Selim came to the boldest resolution that any of his predecessors or successors ever adopted, of reforming the various abuses which were bringing the Turkish empire to ruin. The reforms he meditated, or initiated, may be thus summed up:

1. The abolition of the feudal privileges and revenues from them called Ziamets and Timars, on the deaths of their holders, these revenues to be appropriated to the maintenance of a new military force.

2. An amelioration of provincial government, defining and curtailing the power of the Pachas, limiting their government to a term of three years, and making the renewal of it depend on its satisfactory administration.

3. Abolition of the usage of forming the taxes, and the appointment of imperial officers to whom the collection of revenue was to be alone entrusted.

4. Restriction to the Grand Vizier's power, conferring on the divan the character of a privy council, to which all state measures of importance should be submitted by him, and a new constitution of the Divan, which was to consist of twelve superior ministers with separate functions.

5. The advancement of education and establishment of schools in various parts of the empire, and the establishment of a Greek press in the capital.

6. Provision for permanent embassies in the chief European courts.

7. The establishment of a newly organised, well regulated, standing army on the European model.

This last and most important reform proved fatal to the Sultan. It was no sooner initiated, than the Janissaries mutinied, and the new system had to be abandoned, or rather postponed for the time being.

The new military force called the Nizam Djedid, was first limited to 12,000. From the beginning of the formation of the new body of troops, the Janissaries manifested their repugnance. It was found necessary to have their barracks erected out of the immediate reach of the Janissaries on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus. In 1805 a decree was issued ordering a certain number of the youngest of the Janissary corps to be drafted into that of the Nizam Djedid. No time was lost by the Janissaries in making the necessary preparations for a revolt. Only three years previously, in 1802, they had acted in a similar manner on the occasion of the capture of Mecca and Medina by the Wahabites. These revolts terminated in some conflagrations and murders.

In 1796 a French ambassador to the Porte arrived at Constantinople, bringing with him several pieces of artillery as a present to the Sultan, a number of French artillerymen and engineers to instruct the Turkish engineers (Topidjis) and the

employés of the arsenals and foundries of the Turkish government. French drill serjeants were also brought to instruct Spahis and Janissaries. Some progress was made with the Spahis and Topidjis, but the Janissaries again mutinied and refused to adopt the weapons of the Giaours, and in the course of a few months many of the French instructors returned to their own country. Some of them, however, remained in the service of Omar Aga, the chief of a corps of new troops, disciplined on a European model, which numbered about six hundred in 1798, when Napoleon invaded Egypt, and war was declared between the Porte and the French republic. At that period the number of enrolled members of the military community of the Janissaries scattered over the empire, was about one hundred and fifty thousand on paper; but the muster-rolls of men for whom pay was drawn, did not exhibit one half that number; and of these there was not even half that number soldiers effective in the field, or even if they were in existence, fit for fighting any disciplined European enemy. Their number, however, in the capital, not under thirty thousand, either actually under arms, or following trades from which they could be called in any emergency by their chiefs, was sufficiently large to keep the government in constant terror of them.

The Topidjis, or artillerymen, numbered about thirty thousand, dispersed over the large towns and fortresses of the empire, like the Janissaries, had their head-quarters in the capital, and were very numerous. They were bound to join the standards of the latter whenever they were called on, and in all mutinies made common cause with them. Of such materials, and other masses of irregular troops, feudal contingents, and raw volunteers, seldom enrolled for more than six months' service, an army of three hundred thousand men consisted, which it was possible to set in motion at the beginning of a campaign, at the period that Sultan Selim came to the throne.

The great and the little Napoleon entertained very different sentiments with regard to Italian nationalities. The republic

of Venice was abolished by the treaty of Campio Formio, between the great Napoleon and the Emperor of Austria. The gain of the former by this treaty was the possession of the Ionian Islands, and their dependencies on the continent, Prevesa, Parga, Vonitza, Gomenitza, and Butrinto, a portion of the Venetian territory. The Turks fitted out an expedition from Epirus and wrested Prevesa, Vonitza, and Butrinto from the French. Then the Russians with their new allies, the Turks, conquered the Ionian islands, and soon afterwards co-operated on the shores of Italy to support the Pope. Marvellous are the jumbles of war friendships, the juggles of treaties of alliance, and chance medley combinations of interests at deadly variance, united for momentary purposes of state. In the history and mystery of politics and diplomacy, students cannot speculate too much on the baseness of those exalted individuals, whose great aim is to circumvent one another, and to patter in a double sense about the objects, price, and terms of peace and amity.

The first arrangement made by the high contracting parties, to the new treaty of 1801, was to place the Ionian Islands under the Protectorate of Russia and Turkey. These incongruous protectors soon quarrelled, as it might be expected, about the Ionian spoil.

The juggle of consulting the Greek nationality was had recourse to, on the subject of one of the Protectors withdrawing, and the result, of course, was, that Russia retained the spoil, and remained the sole Protector. In 1807 the possession of these Islands went back to the French, and in a little time, in another jumble of politics, and vicissitude of fortune, England became the new master and protector of the seven islands.

The possession of the old Venetian territory on the mainland had been kindly resigned to Turkey by her generous ally Russia, in 1800. Butrinto, Prevesa, and Vonitza which had been taken by Ali Pacha, of Yanina, were allowed to be retained by him. Parga refused to be given up to the Turks, and for fourteen years resisted all their efforts to rob them of their independence.

They accepted the Protectorate of England, and lived under it for four years; and at the expiration of that time, England to her great dishonour, abandoned the unfortunate island of Parga to its old enemies the Turks, and Ali Pacha of Yanina.

The English Government was offered the Protectorate of the Ionian Islands, in 1815, on the condition of granting them a free constitution. The free constitution consists of an English Governor, an English military force, a House of Assembly of forty members, ostensibly returned by the people of the seven islands; a council composed of six members, selected from the House of Assembly, by the Lord High Commissioner. This council furnishes the several ministries with functionaries. The President of the council has £1,300 a year, each member has £800. The House of Assembly is only allowed to sit once in two years, for four months in every second year. The Lord High Commissioner has the power of convening and proroguing the House of Assembly; the Crown thē right of dissolving. A free constitution, in the sense of the terms of the engagement entered into between Great Britain and the Ionian Republic, the Ionians have not got. The election of members to serve in the House of Assembly is a sheer-sophism, a mere mockery of a representative system. The Lord High Commissioner, made a list of those persons he deemed worthy af the elective franchise, which he sent to each island previously to an election; out of that list the electors had to choose. *This is a free constitution*, after Governor Maitland's manner of making free institutions, and Lord High Commissioner Ward's mode of devising a free Government for a Greek people, and administering it, at the point of the sword, scourge in hand, or a file of soldiers for the maintenance of law and order.

In August, 1798, Turkey entered into a treaty of alliance with England and Russia, against the Republic of France. A Turkish army of 16,000 men was raised, destined to act against the French in Egypt. Another army of 12,000 men was landed at St. Jean d'Acre, in May 1799. This force included a considerable number of the new troops, armed and disciplined on the

European discipline, and during the siege by the French, this body displayed signal courage and subordination, the latter a new element in the composition of Turkish troops. It was reserved, however, for an English force to defeat the French at St. Jean D'Acre, and for another British force to wrest Egypt from them in 1800.

The Sultan Selim's military reforms received signal encouragement from the conduct of the new troops at St. Jean D'Acre, but from the Janissaries, met with nothing but increased hostility.

In 1807, as we have previously seen, the Janissaries serving in the Pachalik of Servia, and in garrison at Belgrade, committed a series of atrocious murders and massacres, and troops had to be sent against them by the sultan.

The Servians were pillaged and massacred by the Janissaries with entire impunity, the magistrates (Kneses) addressed a memorial to the sultan, setting forth the terrible persecution to which the whole Christian population was subjected. This memorial is an irrefragable answer to the statements made, not only by travellers, but by British statesmen, that the Turkish rule was the most tolerant of all governments, and that the Christian Rajahs had the full exercise of their religion, throughout the Turkish Empire. It seems wonderful to me that Christian men can bring themselves to believe, they will not be held accountable at a tribunal of more dread importance than any earthly one of public opinion, for outrageous violations of truth which involve the interests of humanity and justice.

The Servian magistrates, in their memorial to the sultan, state, "That they were not only reduced to abject poverty by the Dahis, but that they were attacked in their religion, their morality and their honour; and that no husband was secure in the possession of his wife, no father of his daughter, no brother of his sister. The church, the cloister, the monastery, all were outraged." They demanded of the sultan—"Art thou still our sovereign? Then come and free us from these persecutors; or, if thou wilt not save us, at least tell us so, that we decide

whether to flee to the mountains and forests, or to seek refuge in the rivers, a termination of our miserable existence."

It was after this memorial had been addressed to the sultan, that the persecution against the Christian Rajahs raged with the greatest fury, till the belief grew general, not only in Servia, but Syria, that it was intended to exterminate the whole Christian community. In this desperate state of affairs, the Servians became patriots, ceased to acknowledge the sultan, and set up a government of their own, and in 1804, took for their supreme chief, under the title of "Commander of Servia," Kara George. The Janissaries and the Dahis were soon driven out of Servia, not without exhibitions of savage ferocity on the part of the Servians, worthy of the teaching, by example, of their former tyrants.

The sultan, with the view more especially of getting rid of the Janissaries who had possession of Belgrade (and in that strong place set no limits to their turbulence, and their insolent defiance of his authority), let the Servians not only have their own way, but allowed them and the Turkish troops to act in common against his rebellious military Janissaries and Dahis. His object was no sooner gained, than he commanded the Servians to lay down their arms and return to their former condition of Rajah subjection to the Porte. This command was disregarded, and as the Servians had now to defend themselves against the sultan's new troops, they determined to seek foreign aid. Austria was first thought of; but that idea was soon given up. Austria had always played a perfidious part in Servia; the country had been occupied by her more than once—she had betrayed the inhabitants, "and had always given back the country and the people to the Turks."

There has been, indeed, a terrible consistency in the conduct of Austria, in all her relations with people in subjection to grinding tyrannies. She has been either uniformly, secretly, and schemingly perfidious, or openly and brutally hostile.

In February, 1804, the Servians applied to Russia for protection and aid, and were advised, in the first instance, to prefer

their demands and complaints to the Porte, and that all the influence of Russia would be employed there in favour of their application. In 1805 they sent an ambassador to Constantinople, instructed to demand that in future the fortresses of Servia should be garrisoned by Turkish troops, and that all arrears of taxes should be remitted. These demands came at a time when the unfortunate Sultan Selim was harassed by the intrigues and contentions of the ambassadors of the four great powers of Europe—Russia, England, France, and Austria.

The rival interests of Russia, England, and France especially, were made the subject this time, of continual diplomatic contests, memorials and rejoinders, projects of alliance, and combined policy and counter projects; England using all her influence to get the Ottoman Porte to declare war against France; Russia using all her efforts to bring ruin on the Turkish Empire, even while entering into treaties of peace and amity with her; France leaving nothing undone to get war declared against England and Russia. In fact the distractions caused in the councils of the Sultan, and in the Divan by the intrigues and machinations of the great powers, were the proximate occasion of the downfall, dethronement, and assassination of one of the best disposed, most enlightened, and friendly to civilization of all the sovereigns of the Turkish Empire.

While Selim was endeavouring to effect his reforms, General Sebastiani, the representative of Buonaparte, pressed the Turkish ministry to change the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia, and thus to involve Turkey in a war with Russia and England, by whom those appointments had been insisted on at the Porte. The position of Selim now became one of extreme difficulty and embarrassment; he was at once exposed to the machinations of Russia on his frontiers to the power of France on land, in Greece and the Danubian provinces, and of England at sea.

The English ambassador in vain endeavoured to undermine the French minister's influence at the Porte; but finding his efforts ineffectual, he quitted Constantinople on the 20th

January, 1807, and from the frigate in which he had taken refuge, endeavoured to accomplish his objects by repeated representations to the Ottoman government. On the failure of his efforts, an English fleet, under Admiral Duckworth, entered the Dardanelles, and passing with the tide, and a fair wind, the formidable batteries on both sides of the channel, entered the Bosphorus, destroyed a Turkish ship of the line and five frigates, and approached within a few miles of the imperial city. This measure of absurd temerity and braggadocio, so far from producing any favourable results, excited the utmost fury in the Turkish capital against the British nation. The Sultan himself was carried along with the popular feeling, and the French ambassador and his suite gave their valuable assistance in strengthening the defences of Constantinople. The English Admiral, after having in vain attempted to intimidate the divan, at length found it essential to his safety to set sail, and make a precipitate escape through the Dardanelles, before the active preparations of the Turks should render his exit from the Sea of Marmora impossible. He fortunately succeeded in his object, although not without the loss of several men, and considerable injury to some of his ships.

The English operations in Egypt, where a descent had been made, were not more propitious. The Mameluke Beys were then making a stand for their authority in that province; and the rebel Beys were supported by the influence and army of England. The English force despatched, in 1807, on an expedition of so much moment, amounted only to about 5,000 men. On landing in Egypt the soldiers were most favourably received in Alexandria, but on proceeding to Rosetta, a great disaster befel them. The gates were opened for their reception, but on entering the narrow streets, they were instantly attacked by a considerable force, who poured upon them a murderous fire from the windows and loopholes of the houses, and from every available point, and who were themselves secure from assault by the positions which they occupied. The English force,

utterly unable to defend themselves, were almost annihilated, and the few who escaped the carnage found the situation of those who remained in Alexandria had, in consequence of their defeat, become critical in the extreme. An attempt immediately afterwards made to reduce Rosetta proved wholly unsuccessful, in consequence of the able and vigorous conduct of the Pasha. Eventually the English capitulated and quitted Egypt, while at the same time the English fleets were withdrawn from the Archipelago.

At this juncture the various Pashaliks in Europe and Asia were called upon by the Sultan for an extraordinary levy, and Mustafa Baraictar, an able and energetic general, and a faithful friend of the Sultan, was advanced to the dignity of Vizier. The new army thus raised, consisting in a great measure of Janissaries from various parts of the empire, having been reviewed with great pomp by the Sultan, while the Nizam Djeddid, to obviate the difficulties which might otherwise have arisen, were not incorporated with the rest of the forces, but disposed of in the various fortresses along the coast.

It was requisite that Mustafa Bairactar should proceed to the provinces in command of the army, and this circumstance, together with the death of the Mufti, which had recently occurred, a man of enlightenment, devotedly attached to his master, proved fatal to the Sultan, whom it left exposed to the secret of the Janissaries and the Ulemas, the great opponents of his reforms. The Sultan had elected to the vacant office of Mufti, a person whom he supposed favourable to his views. But under a mask of zeal for the new order of things, he concealed feelings of deadly hatred. This man's secret purpose of overthrowing the new military schemes was shared in by another official named Musa, who also owed his advancement to the authority of Kaimakan to his assumed zeal for reform. The departure of the troops from Constantinople, and the absence of the most faithful as well as sagacious supporters of the Sultan, offered a favourable opportunity to the traitors for carrying out the plot which they had formed.

The sequel of this new conspiracy of the Janissaries and Ulemas is soon told.

Incorporated with the regiments of the Nizam Djeddid, in the various fortresses of the Bosphorus, there were about two thousand Albanians who assisted at the batteries. These adventurers Selim used every means in his power to render amenable to the new discipline; but Musa contrived to remove every favourable impression made by enlisting some of the Janissaries, who represented to them that they of right belonged to their ancient order, and ought to hold in contempt the endeavours of the Sultan to assimilate them with the soldiers of the infidels. The Albanians were thus excited to rebellion, and on being called upon to assume the uniform chosen by Selim, attacked Mahmoud Effendi; who had gone to the principal fortress on the Bosphorus, to pay the troops and bestow on them their new clothing. Mahmoud was defended by the Nizam Djeddid, and contrived by their aid to escape in a boat; but on endeavouring to land, was seized by the Albanians, who had followed him along the shore, and put to death. The other batteries of the Bosphorus joined in the rebellion. The soldiers of the Nizam Djeddid were overpowered by the Yamaks, and driven from their posts, and the commandant shared the fate of Mahmoud. Musa declared to the Albanians that the opportunity was arrived for completely overturning the new military institutions. Having assembled on the plains of Buyukdere they marched into the city, while the infamous Musa had contrived, after a friendly entertainment in his palace, to put to death some of the most faithful officers of the Sultan. On entering Constantinople, the Albanian rebels were joined by such of the disaffected Janissaries as had been left in the capital. Their first victims were those already marked out by Musa and the Muftee, whom Selim, at the representation of the malignant traitors, permitted to be put to death, issuing at the same time a decree suppressing the new military institutions which it had cost him so much trouble and anxiety to organize. But the hatred of the two traitors to the Sultan

himself could not be satisfied with this triumph, and by their intrigues the multitudes were incited to demand the deposition of Selim, and the elevation of Mustapha, a son of Abdul Hamid, to the Ottoman throne. Selim saw that it was useless to offer any opposition, and in compliance with the popular desire, resigned his crown to Mustapha. This event put a period to his plans for the improvement of the troops. The Nizam Djeddid finding their implacable adversaries triumphant and the Sultan dethroned, disbanded themselves, and hastened to regain their native provinces.

"The new sultan, Mustapha IV., (says a recent writer on Turkish history) possessed, like his father, Abdul Hamid, a feeble character, and was wholly unfitted to meet with firmness the exigencies of the time. It was immediately apparent that, being himself destitute of sufficient abilities, he must necessarily become the tool of those energetic, but unscrupulous persons, to whom he owed his elevation to the supreme authority. The Mufti, indeed, together with the other hypocrite and traitor, Musa, exercised the sovereign power without control.

"While these events were occurring in Turkey, the Emperor Napoleon was pursuing his brilliant carreer in the war with Russia. Early in June, 1807, the famous battle of Friedland was fought, which may be justly said to have almost completely broken the power of the Emperor Alexander. Napoleon, however, was not disposed to continue the course he had hitherto pursued, and listened to the advances made by his northern adversary, for the establishment of peace. Accordingly, the celebrated treaty of Tilsit was concluded between the belligerents, by which their intention was to divide between them the whole sovereignty of Europe. Among the stipulations of this treaty, there was one which referred to the Ottoman Empire, and ran as follows :—'If, in consequence of the recent changes which have occurred at Constantinople (viz., the deposition of Selim III., and the elevation of Mustapha to the throne), the Porte shall not accept the mediation of France, or if, having

accepted it, it shall happen that during the course of three months, the negociations are not brought to a satisfactory conclusion, France will make common cause with Russia, against the Ottoman Porte, and the two high contracting powers will concert measures to withdraw all the provinces of the Ottoman Empire in Europe (Constantinople, and the province of Roumelia excepted), from the yoke and vexations of the Turk.' It is obvious that the elevation of Mustapha was regarded both by Buonaparte and Alexander as affording a favourable opportunity to dismember Turkey, and divide the empire between them. This opportunity was rendered the more valuable by the intrigues of the Mufti and Musa, between whom there had long existed a secret but intense degree of hatred, and which led to gross neglect of the interests of the Ottoman Empire: which might, under a vigorous and sagacious executive, have been materially advanced during the success of Napoleon against the Russian arms.

"The reign of Mustapha, and the domination of the two unprincipled ministers to whom he owed his throne, were not destined to be of very long duration. Bairactar, the faithful and affectionate friend of Selim, resolved to avenge his fall, and if possible, to restore him to the sovereignty. The mufti exercising his powerful influence in the Ulema and the soldiery, had already succeeded in procuring the banishment of Musa, and the Kaimakan, who had been appointed to succeed him, represented to Bairactar the possibility of restoring his beloved and injured master, by a vigorous movement upon Constantinople at the head of his troops. Bairactar had already succeeded in awakening the jealousy of the grand vizier, and the chief officers of the State against the mufti and the leaders of those Yamaks who had been mainly instrumental in the deposition of Selim. He advanced, therefore, with his troops to Adrianople, whence the grand vizier proceeded to Constantinople with the Sanjak-sheriff, and thus gained possession of the city, whither he was immediately followed by Bairactar and his Albanian troops.

"That intrepid and energetic leader, now easily procured the punishment of the Mufti and the Yamaks, and finding the grand vizier averse to the restoration of Selim, he seized upon, and threw him into prison, and on the 28th of July, pressed on with his soldiers, to the seraglio, bearing the sacred standard, the authority of which gained him and his soldiers admission to the outer court of the palace. The inner entrance, however, was closed against him; but he had brought forward his artillery, and was resolved to blow the gates to pieces, if the refusal to admit him were persisted in.

"While he was demanding admission, and openly proclaiming his intention to reinstate Selim, the Sultan Mustapha returned to the palace by the private entrance on the Bosphorus, and ordered Bairactar to be informed that, as he desired the reappearance of Selim, his desire should be granted. That unfortunate monarch, therefore, was immediately strangled, and his body cast down before his faithful follower, who now gained an entrance into the interior of the palace. Overpowered by grief, Bairactar threw himself on the remains of his beloved master, incapable, from the intensity of his emotion, of thinking of anything beyond the irreparable loss which he had sustained."*

* Turkey, Ancient and Modern; by the Rev. R. W. Fraser. 1854., p. 381.

CHAPTER XV.

Sultan Mustapha IV.—1807—1808.
Sultan Mahmoud II.—1808—1839.

The deposition of Sultan Selim III. on the 29th of May, 1807, had opened a path to the Ottoman throne to his cousin Mustapha, then in his 30th year. Mustapha owed his elevation to the Janissaries, the deposers of Selim. He was destitute alike of moral and mental qualities of any worth or value. The few months he enjoyed the title of Padishaw and Sultan, the Janissaries in reality possessed the sovereign power. About a year after his accession to the throne, the formidable attempt, briefly referred to by Frazer, was made to restore the deposed Sultan by Mustapha Bairactar, Pasha of Ruschuck, a confidential servant and attached friend of Selim. He no sooner heard of the revolt of the Janissaries and its issue—the elevation of Mustapha and the imprisonment of Selim—than he collected a body of Albanian and Bosnian troops of about forty thousand men, and marched on the capital. He encamped his forces on the plains of Daoud, about fourteen miles from Constantinople, and soon after unfurled on the walls of the Seraglio—the Imperial palace—the sacred standard of Mohammed, which he had carried with him from the head-quarters of the army he commanded on the Danube. The seraglio was defended by the Bostanjis and other adherents of the Janissaries and Ulemas, and the entrance of Bairactar and his forces was obstinately resisted by the former, the supporters

of Mustapha. Bairactar assaulted the seraglio and soon effected an entrance into the enclosures of the palace, but before he had gained possession of the interior of its several structures, the Sultan Mustapha IV. gave orders that both the deposed Sultan Selim, and his own brother Mahmoud, both of whom were then in safe keeping in the seraglio, should be strangled.

When the Sultan Amurath IV. died, A.D. 1640, his brother Ibrahim was the sole representative of the house of Osman in male descent, and Amurath on his death bed had ordered that brother of his, and last scion of the stock of the founder of his house, to be put to death. Ibrahim was then, and during the whole of the reign of Amurath had been, a close prisoner in the royal palace, and for the last eight years of it had been in constant terror of the bow-string. When the news was brought to him that his brother Amurath was dead, Ibrahim in his terror, thinking the executioners were at his door, refused to admit the grandees of the empire, who came to him to announce his accession to the throne, and barricaded his door against them. It was only when the mother of both devised an ingenious plan to convince her youngest son that her eldest born was dead, that Ibrahim took courage to unbar his doors.

The Sultana mother ordered the dead body of Amurath to be placed before his brother Ibrahim, that he might look on it and take courage.

What a subject for a picture would the scene be, of the dead body of that ferocious Sultan who could "bear no brother near the throne," laid before the terrified brother, and the latter gazing on the corpse of his would-be murderer!

When Sultan Mustapha IV. gave his orders for the assassination of Selim and his own brother, events were occurring of which a few minutes would have frustrated their execution as far as respected Selim, for Bairactar's triumph was complete in that brief interval. But Sultan Mustapha, anticipating that success, had determined he should be the only representative

of the house of Othman left alive, and consequently no Turk would think of murdering or deposing the last scion of that brave stock, of the sacred house of Islamism. The ministers of Mustapha's bloody orders, had only time to accomplish the murder of Selim, but not before he had made a desperate resistance, which would have been successful had it been maintained only a few minutes longer. Other executioners, bow-string in hand, in the meantime were ransacking the apartments of Mahmoud in a fruitless search for their intended victim. The young Mahmoud had been secreted by a devoted slave in the furnace of a bath, and while hidden in that place Bairactar, at the head of his victorious Albanians, having seen the dead body of his royal master Selim, and avenged his death on all he found in arms, or among the inmates of the seraglio—who were considered partizans of the Janissaries—rushed into the audience-chamber where the Sultan Mustapha had seated himself on the throne, hoping to awe the conspirators against his dignity, by this exhibition of imperial state; but Bairactar unceremoniously dragged down the Padishaw, exclaiming:—"What dost thou in that place? Yield it to a worthier." This event took place the 28th of July, 1808.

Thus passed away another Padishaw, and his successor and brother Mahmoud the Second (the future reforming Sultan) was dragged out of his hiding place in the furnace of a bath to occupy the imperial throne, which had been filled not many minutes previously by his brother. The imperial brothers changed places, the deposed Sultan Mustapha occupied, as a captive in the seraglio, apartments which had been reserved for unfortunate princes of the house of Othman. And a little later he was murdered in his captivity; thus in the short space of eight or ten months two Sultan's had been deposed and subsequently executed.

Sultan Mahmoud II., 1808—1839.

MAHMOUD II. came out of his hiding-place, in the furnace of a bath, to take his seat on the Ottoman throne, at a period of civil strife, not only in the capital, but in several provinces, of the Empire. A year previous to his accession, in June, 1807, the celebrated treaty of Tilsit was concluded between the Emperor of Russia and Napoleon, in one of the secret articles of which in certain contingencies, it was provided, "that France shall make common cause with Russia, against the Ottoman Porte, and the two high contracting powers will concert measures to withdraw all the provinces of the Ottoman Empire in Europe (Constantinople, and the province of Roumelia excepted), from the yoke and vexations of the Turk."

The two imperial concocters of territorial robberies on a grand scale, a little later in their negociations at Erfurt (through the ministers of Napoleon with Alexander), discussed the subject of the dismemberment of Turkey; two plans for which were deliberated on; by one of which it was proposed that Turkey should retain their possessions in Asia, and some of their European territories; by another the dismemberment was to be of that sweeping nature, that the Turkish Empire was to be virtually destroyed. It was proposed in the first scheme to give Russia the Moldo-Wallachian provinces, and Bulgaria, and the Balkan for a boundary; to France, Greece, Albania and Candia; and things were to be made pleasant to Austria by the cession of Bosnia and Servia.

The second plan extended the proposed cession to Austria, the whole of Macedonia was thrown into the territorial swag, to be allotted to that power, with the exception of the town and harbour of Salonika. By it also, the great looter of lands not his own—Napoleon—was to get, in addition to Greece, Albania, and Candia, all the islands of the Archipelago, Cyprus, and two countries to boot, of some little consequence on the map

of that portion of the world, bordering on the Mediterranean, which sea was to become, in due course of time, a great French lake.

The autocrat of all the Russias was only accorded by this second scheme of partition, in addition to Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bulgaria, the Asiatic provinces nearest the Bosphorus—and to give a little more value to her share of the European spoil, Thrace was generously thrown into the bargain by the diplomatic agents of the Great Napoleon. The Turks were to be driven out of Europe, and thrust back into Asia, beyond Mount Taurus.

But "the key to Russia," Constantinople, was obstinately refused by Napoleon to the Czar. The French minister, Caulaincourt, positively refused to enter into any terms proposed by the Russian negociator for this much desired object. All that he could hear of was a project to make Constantinople and the shores of the Dardanelles, a neutral territory, and free state city, on the Hanseatic model, after the fashion of Hamburgh or Bremen.

The diplomatic schemers in vain endeavoured to juggle each other on this ticklish point of the key to the Czar's house. *They could not agree on what was to be done with Constantinople.* Their masters soon after could not agree on any point, and when the strong rogues fell out, the poor weak sick man was enabled to hold his own a little longer.

In January, 1809, Austria, in opposition to France and Russia, by her mediation with Turkey, effected a reconciliation between the Porte and England. The treaty of the Dardanelles, of the above date, was the result.

As a matter of course, the unfortunate Porte, a little later, was driven to a declaration of war against Russia.

In June, 1809, after a long series of diplomatic intrigues, machinations, and juggleries, in which, at one period, the power and influence of the French ambassador was triumphant at the Porte; at another time those of the ambassador of Russia; and finally those of the English minister, Sir R. Adair, we find by a

dispatch of the latter, dated June, 1809, that the empire was on the verge of ruin. "It might be said to have been without a government, from the time of the death of Mustapha." The provinces were in a great state of disorder, and the whole financial system was in a state of complete disorganization, and in such circumstances war broke out between the Turks and the Russians, and, as usual, it was on the Danube. And yet at this very crisis of the fate of the empire, the Janissaries were in one of their periodical frenzies of revolt.

For a considerable time they refused to acknowledge the grand vizier appointed by the sultan, and consequently his office, for a length of time was in abeyance. It is very worthy of notice, that at this period of extreme disorder of the finances, and of disorganisation of the Janissaries, Sir R. Adair, in a dispatch to his government, states the enthusiasm by which the whole mass of the population of the empire was animated, to carry the war with Russia into the enemy's country, exceeded anything known in the memory of modern times. And it was in these circumstances, he states, that an attempt was made to obtain a loan from England, which proved ineffectual, though a negociation for it with the English minister was carried on for a considerable time, in a way calculated to give the Porte to understand that a loan might be obtained from the English government, though not from English merchants, on certain conditions, binding the Turkish government to guarantee the payment of it in Turkish produce.

But the prime minister of the Porte, in conference with the English minister, proposed another mode of guarantee, very remarkable for its novelty and the nature of the securities that were offered, and the first manifestation of the designs of the Sultan to effect innovations utterly at variance with the fundamental principles of the Mohammedan religion. The Turkish minister, Vaschid Effendi, Sir R. Adair states, said, "*That it was intended to propose that the Mufti, Ulemas, and the whole body of their law should join in an act pledging the revenues ap-*

propriated for the maintenance of their religion, for the repayment of the sum borrowed."

The daring nature of the proposed measure is deserving of attention, and it cannot fail to be obvious to everyone acquainted with Turkish affairs, that had an attempt been made to carry it into effect, Sultan Mahmoud would inevitably have paid for any loan thus guaranteed, with his life. The negociation, happily for both the Turkish Empire and the Sultan, was unsuccessful. Ruin was reserved for a later period, and other financial embarrassments; for the fatal system of contracting loans, which some years later was to be carried into effect; a system—considering the precarious nature of the Turkish revenue, and the impossibility of its expansion to an amount commensurate with the charges of a national debt of annual augmentation—fraught with greater peril than even the hostility of Russia, or any wars that power could carry on single-handed against Turkey.

The war that was then existing between Russia and Turkey had commenced in 1808, and was carried on till 1812, without any decisive results. Several battles were fought with varying success, but without any serious impression on the territories of either of the belligerents. The Turkish army was defeated at Battin, and lost some important fortresses; but the Russians failed in all their operations against the grand vizier's army at Shumla; they were signally defeated at Rustchuk, losing in that engagement eight thousand men, killed and wounded. All their attempts to penetrate through Shumla, across the Balcan were unsuccessful.

Peace was made between the two powers, and by the treaty of Bucharest, which was signed on the 28th of May, 1812, the river Pruth was made the boundary between the Russian and Turkish Empires. All Moldavia to the right of the Pruth, and the whole of Wallachia, were given back to Turkey, and all the fortresses of Servia were given up to the Sultan to be again occupied by Turkish garrisons, in violation of all the solemn

assurances given by Russia to the Servians, at the commencement of the war.

If Christianity has two codes of morals, one binding only the consciences of individuals, in their private relations, and the other governing the consciences of sovereigns, statesmen, and diplomatists, in dealings with public or national interests, acts which would be accounted villanies on the part of one class, may pass simply as measures of justifiable expediency on the part of the other. Reasons of state in that case may plead for the latter at the bar of God's justice, and bring the high contracting parties, who practice perfidy on a grand scale, harmless through the final inquest and ordeal on the day of judgment. But most assuredly that result can only be expected for them, or looked forward to by them, in the event of the Great Judge being a respecter of persons, and the eternal laws of justice having varied application to mankind, as people happen to be distributed in different orders and conditions. The perfidy of a miscreant in private life, who betrays a trusting friend, differs in no respect in its criminality from the perfidy of the Emperor Alexander to the Christian Rayahs of Turkey in Moldavia, Wallachia, and Servia, whom he excited to rebellion, and abandoned for a state purpose, regardless of all his solemn engagements to them, and the calamities which this violation of them occasioned; or the perfidy of the Emperor Napoleon to the unfortunate Sultan Selim, when he entered into alliance with him, entangled him in diplomatic relations with Russia, cajoled him with assurances of effectual support, inveigled him into a war with England and Austria, and at the very time the credulous Mohammedan sovereign was led to repose entire confidence in his professions of amity, was plotting at Erfurt with the Russian Czar against him, and planning the dismemberment of the Turkish empire. When villains of the exalted class of princes, ministers of state, and diplomatic agents pass away, men of great fame for circumventing weaker intelligences, or overturning feebler states by secret fraud, or open violence, or depriving a nation of independence by the

baser practice of corruption, of what avail will all their successes be to them in another world? It will be in vain to plead for them, that their acts of perfidy, injustice, or falsehood, were perpetrated in their capacity of princes, or statesmen, or counsellors, or public functionaries, and not in that of private persons. All the miserable pretexts for state crime participated in by many, ordained by one set of authorities, sanctioned by another, advocated in a court, a council, or a parliament, in despatches, protocols, or in the press, or delegated to agents, to be executed with all due formalities, official, or judicial, will be of no avail.

The sophistry that here below surrounds the practical atheism, professing Christianity, of our *haute politique;* our aggressive wars, and raides, territorial robberies, and fraudulent acquisitions, and annexations of other nations' rightful possessions, institutions will afford no cover for it there.

CHAPTER XVI.

Sultan Mahmoud II.—The Wahabis.

At this period Mohammed Ali, Pacha of Egypt, was beginning to play a foremost part in the affairs of Egypt, and of those of Mecca and Medina, then just wrested by him from the Wahabites.

"The Sultan, about the same time, determined on turning his powerful Egyptian vassal to some account, now ordered him to proceed into Arabia on a campaign against the Wahabees. This powerful sect was founded by Sheikh Abd-el-Wahab, in the middle of the last century, and was to Mohammedanism, very much what Puritanism was to the English Church. It also called the sword to the assistance of its faith, and took possession of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina in 1810. Encouraged by their success, these stern fanatics turned their power to practical and profitable purposes; and pillaged indiscriminately the caravans of pilgrims and merchants, until they had acquired immense wealth, and entirely possessed themselves of the country of the Hedjaz.

"The commands of the Porte to exterminate this sect were intended to exhaust the resources of Mohammed Ali, and perhaps to lead to his destruction; but he embraced the commission with gratitude. It gave him an opportunity of rendering his name popular as a defender of Islam, and an excuse for raising a larger army, which was destined for higher

ulterior purposes. Tousoon, the viceroy's son, had been appointed a Pasha of two tails, and was to lead the expedition; but before he departed on his mission, the Mamelukes were sacrificed as a hecatomb to the peace of the province. Invited to a conference and a feast, and entrapped in the citadel of Cairo, they were massacred almost to a man. This took place on the 1st of March, 1811; and in the autumn of the same year, the expedition proceeded to its destination in Arabia. At first the armies of the orthodox encountered some severe checks; but the following year Medina was restored to the Porte, and in 1812 Mohammed Ali proceeded in person to the Hedjaz, partly to superintend the war, but principally, perhaps, to allow an opportunity for his celebrated appropriation of all Egypt to be announced by his minister Mohammed Laz. The Porte, taking advantage of the absence of the viceroy, with the treachery and meanness peculiar to the justices of the divan, appointed a successor to Mohammed Ali, in the person of Lateef Pasha. Treachery, however, seldom failed to find its match in Egypt, and Lateef was beheaded by the lieutenant of him who was viceroy in his own right."*

The Sultans of the Osmanli of Constantinople had no standing or position in Arabia, as protectors of the Mohammedan faith, prior to the beginning of the 16th century.

In 1517 (A.D.) Sultan Selim I., having overcome the last of the Khalifs of Cairo, became the acknowledged successor of the latter, and the guardian of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, and imperial protector of the annual caravans of hadges, or pilgrims.

The Turkish religion had been long spared the fate of all religions established by the sword, it did not break down soon or suddenly, but it became degraded and desecrated by connexion with state power. The corruptions of religion among the Turks, engendered gross superstitions. Tombs became temples, shrines, and sanctuaries; virtuous and valorous men,

* Warberton's "Crescent and the Cross," 1845.—Vol. ii. p. 32.

saints. Stones even obtained reverence and something more. The Turkish people became zealots, luxurious, sensual, effeminate, and fanatical. In this state of things, in the latter half of the last century, an Arabian Wesley sprang up in the deserts of Western Arabia. Sheik Abdul Wahab, born at Al-Hautas, or, as some state, near Derayeh, in Al-Aynah, in the province of Nesjd, was the son of the Sheik of the Beni Wahab Arabs, an off-shoot of the great tribe of Semim. Abdul Wahab had been educated in the school of Bosrah, that is to say, versed in Mohammedan theology. He had made pilgrimages to Mecca and Medina, resided for some years at Damascus, had held controversies there with the great doctors of Islamism, and, in all probability, was not unacquainted with the Rabbis of the Jews, and the priests of the Christian churches. Scarcely anything is to be learned of his habits, talents, or acquirements, all that Burckardt could discover of his early history was, that he displayed great zeal in the abolition of abuses, spiritual and temporal, and denounced tyranny and superstition. His doctrine was misrepresented, he was slandered, persecuted, and had eventually to fly from Syria to Mosul with his family. He established himself at Derayeh, the principal town of the territory, that had Mohammed Ibn Saoud for its chief. Saoud became the disciple of the reforming Abdul Wahab, married his daughter, and soon drew the sword to defend and propagate the tenets of his father-in-law, Abdul Wahab. The disciple seemed to arrogate to himself the mission of extending the reform among the Arabs, and with it his power and dominion.

The religion of Abdul Wahab was a reduction of Mohammedanism to the narrowest limits of Deism, that was compatible with a belief in the agency of angels, the mission of prophets, and the excellence of the most perfect of all of them, Mohammed. This doctrine commanded men to believe in one true God, to understand religion, to know his prophet Mohammed, to reverence Jesus and Moses as virtuous, holy, men,

and minor prophets, to be resigned to the Divine will, to do good works, to believe firmly in the tenets of Islam, and the mission of Mohammed; to give one-fifth of one's income in alms; to fast during the Ramazan; to make pilgrimages without superstitious practices to Mecca, to be always conscious of the omnipresence and omniscience of the Deity; to believe that Mohammed the prophet was a mortal like all other men, and not of a divine nature, but the most perfect of the sons of men, and his Koran true and perfect in all its parts. It was declared that its truths were to be propagated by the sword; and the opponents of the reformed purified religion were to be exterminated; that no divine worship was to be paid to Mohammed, nor to saints, or at the tombs of saints; that all splendid tombs and idolatrous shrines were to be destroyed; that traditions were not to be relied on; that all scandalous and degrading vices were to be abolished, luxuries restrained, the use of wine, opium, and tobacco to be given up. But in all these reforms the letter of the law of Mohammed was not violated or infringed. Reformation was a new cry in Arabia. The Koran—the whole Koran—and nothing but the Koran! No saints—no shrines —no gorgeous sepulchres.

For a time Abdul Wahab was the spiritual chief of the Nejd Province, and Sheik Ibn Saoud possessed the temporal authority. The chief power was in the hands of the latter, who derived a large revenue from the protection of the reformed faith. One of the principal sources of the revenue of the Wahabi country was—"One-fifth part of the booty taken from heretics."

In 1748 and 1749 the Pasha of Bagdad made war on the followers and adherents of "the famous fanatic, Mohammed Ibn Abdul Wahab," whose "impious doctrines sapped the fundamental principles of Islam, and who set himself up as the head of a new religion."*

* See Univer. Biogr. Dict. Life of Ahmet Pasha El Hagi.

The Arab reformer, Abdul Wahab, died in extreme old age, 1787. The Sheik of Derayeh, and the province of Nejd, had died nearly two years previously, in 1765.

Too little is known of the former.

The successor of Sheik Saoud was his son Abdul Aziz, who greatly extended the power of the Wahabi's, and spread their influence over the Bedouins of a great part of Arabia, from the shores of the Red Sea, to the frontiers of Syria, and Asia Minor.

In 1792—93 the Wahabis made a successful campaign against the Grand Sheik of Mecca—Ghaleb.

In 1797, Soliman, the Pasha of Bagdad, attacked the Wahabis in El Hassa, but was routed; the victorious Arabs overran the Bosrah country, took the holy town and mosque of Imam Hussein, plundered the famous temple of all the treasures lavished on it by the Turkish Sultans and the Persian Shahs, and destroyed the sacred building.

In 1801 another Turkish army, with a strong body of Arabs of Irak, marched into the Wahabi territory of Nejd, and were advancing against Derayeh, when the Sheik, Thæni, the chief of the Beni Montefik Bedouins, and commander of the Arab auxiliaries of the Turks, was murdered by a fanatic Wahabi, and it is said the other chiefs of the Turks were bribed by the chief of the Wahabis, Abdul Aziz, for the Turks fled suddenly, and were afterwards attacked by the Wahabis, and the whole Turkish army was destroyed.

In the same year, 1801, Abdul Aziz, at the head of 100,000 men, made a fresh expedition against Tayef, and Roufodah, a port on the Red Sea, took both places, conquered the rest of Hedjaz, and, in 1803, took Mecca. The Wahabis slaughtered many orthodox Mussulman sheiks, and other true believers, who refused to adopt the reformed faith; they plundered the holy places, and sepulchres of the Mohammedan saints, spoiled the famous mosque of Mecca, with all its costly furniture, precious gifts and offerings, and the year following (1804) they took Medina, plundered the tomb of Mohammed, and left it in ruins.

Previously to this last exploit of Wahabi piety and zeal for

reform, Abdul Aziz had, in 1803, been murdered by a Persian fanatic, and was succeeded by his son, Saoud.

The Mohammedan world was thrown into consternation by the astounding intelligence of the spoiling and violation of the tomb of the Prophet of the Faithful, at the hands of the heretic Wahabis. For six years, from 1803 to 1809, the pilgrimages were stopped; no great caravans traversed the deserts of Arabia. Saoud extended largely his territory by constant wars. He conquered the whole province of El Hassa, and several towns on the shore of the Persian Gulf—the piratical inhabitants of which embraced the Wahabi doctrine, became troublesome to British commerce, and were signally punished by a British expedition in 1809, sent against them in conjunction with the forces of the Imam of Muscat, the English troops being commanded by Sir Lionel Smith.

In 1810 Saoud carried the war to the very gates of Damascus, and plundered thirty-five villages in the Hauran district, within two days' journey of Damascus.

Saoud, who had maintained a war of heresy for so many years with success, died in 1814, and was succeeded by his son, Abdulla, a man wholly unequal to his position. A sort of theocracy had been established at Derayeh by the Wahabis, and Abdulla was the last of the heretical chiefs who occupied the first place in it. His father had pillaged and defiled the prophet's tomb at Mecca, he had plundered Medina at the head of forty thousand men. The holy shrine and sepulchre of Hassan, the son of Ali, and grandson of the prophet, the sacred place of pilgrimage of the Persians, had also been ravaged, and desecrated by the Wahabis. There had been under Saoud great ravages of sacred shrines and tombs, fearful excesses of sanguinary saints and fierce persecutors. Ibrahim Pacha brought the long protracted contest to an end.

In 1809, Mohammed Ali, Pacha of Egypt, announced his determination to come to the rescue of the true believers, and commenced his preparations for a great expedition against the Wahabis.

The massacre of the Mamelukes by Mohammed Ali, furnishes

the date of the Pacha's publicly announced intention of undertaking the war against the Wahabis in Arabia; of the Porte conferring on his second son, Toussoun, the dignity of a Pacha of the second order, and the command of the expedition in defence of the orthodox faith, against the impious Wahabis.

The first of March, 1811, was fixed by Mohammed Ali for the investiture of the new Pacha, for consultation, avowedly with the Mamelukes, about the approaching war with the Arabian Schismatics, for the massacre in reality of the guests and chiefs he had invited to a banquet and a council.

Toussoun Pacha entered Arabia in 1811, and in 1812 was beaten by the Wahabis, near Medina; but later the same year took that town.

In January, 1812, after Toussoun's defeat at Djedeyde near Reder, by the Wahabis, under the two sons of Saoud Abdallah and Faysal Mehmet Ali, through his emissaries, distributed much money among the Bedouin Sheiks, with a view of detaching the Arabs of the desert from the Wahabis.

In the battle of Djedeyde, the Wahabis amounted to 20,000 infantry, and six or eight hundred horsemen.

Mecca however was taken by Toussoun Pacha and the Turks in 1813; but although the five principalities of the Hedjaz had also fallen into the hands of the Turks, the Wahabi power was still formidable. Toussoun Pacha broke faith with Ghaleb, the chief ruler of Mecca, who was sent a prisoner to Turkey, was detained there and died in captivity.

In September, 1813, Mehmet Ali Pacha arrived with a large force from Egypt at Djedda, and employed his forces for some months in forays and *razèes*. In May, 1814, Saoud died.

In 1815 the Egyptians were defeated at Zohran, but they achieved a signal victory at Bessel. Toussun Pacha offered and paid a reward of six dollars for every head of a Wahabi brought to him, and having obtained 6,000, he had them piled up in a pyramid.

Peace however was proclaimed in 1815, and favourable con-

ditions were granted to Abdulla, but hostilities recommenced before the new negociations were quite completed.

In 1816 Ibrahim Pacha, the eldest son of Mehmet Ali, entered Arabia, at the head of another Egyptian expedition. After a protracted resistance, the Wahabis were finally besieged at Derayeh, and Abdullah surrendered in December 1818. With acts of savage cruelty, hardly to be paralleled in Arabian warfare, Ibrahim brought the war to a successful issue—sent the unfortunate Wahabi chief, with several members of his family, to Constantinople, where they were promenaded through the streets for three days—then beheaded—and their bodies treated with all sorts of outrages. Ibrahim desolated Derayeh—made a desert of the place—and called it making peace.

But the Wahabis, tho' broken, were not exterminated; they renewed the struggle in 1824. In 1827 they gave great trouble to Mehemet Ali, and in 1838 and 1839 the Pacha had to send an army against them in the eastern part of Nejid, which was commencing extensive and successful operations, when Mehemet had to recall his troops for the campaign of Syria, which opened so inauspiciously for the Turks, with the battle of Nizibi.*

A modern French writer, who treats of the Wahabis and their wars—Mons. Sedillot—"Histoire des Arabes," at page 460, says, of the last campaign of Toussoun Pacha, in 1812:

"The English, having obtained information of the events in Arabia through the medium of Lady Hester Stanhope, took steps to unite the Bedouins of Syria with the Ottomans, and subsidized the Wahabis with the view of dissolving the confederation, which counted already 1600 tents.

"There was a great battle, near Hamah, between the Arabs of the desert under Draghi, numbering 80,000 of the confedera-

* These notes are chiefly taken from Burckhardt's "Notes on the Bedouins and Wahabis." "Mengen's Histoire de L'Egypte." Paris, 1823. Nibuhr's "Description de L'Arabie," and Ali Bey's "Travels."

tion, and the Wahabis, amounting to 100,000 men. The battle was gained by Draghi. He caused his enemies to fly, and pursued them successfully to the confines of Nejid. . . . . Mons. de Lascaris (a French agent in Arabia), in 1802, had succeeded in his mission beyond his desires. But at his return to France (about 1812), the fortune of Napoleon had greatly changed. It was the period when the grand army of Napoleon, heretofore invincible, was in retreat from Moscow. Mons. de Lascaris died of the effect of disappointment, &c." *

To form any just opinion of the statement made by Mons. L. A. Sedillot, respecting the part alleged to have been taken by Lady Hester Stanhope in those affairs, in carrying out the supposed objects of the British government, it would be necessary to refer to the various accounts published by English travellers of Lady Hester Stanhope, to ascertain if reference had been made by her to this subject in any of her recorded conversations, to ascertain if she had any relations with the Arabs of the Hedjaz, with ministerial people in England, and with English diplomatists in Turkey.† I believe the result of such inquiries would be, that there was no truth whatever in the statement I have just referred to, in M. Sedillot's work.

I have stated in my "Travels in Turkey, &c.," that "Lady Hester Stanhope told me, the only part she ever took in the

* "Ayant en connaissance de ces faits, les Anglais, par l'entremise de Lady Stanhope, cherchèrent â réunir les Bédouins de Syrie avec les Ottomans, et solderent les Wahabis pour defendre la confédération qui comptait déjà près de sept mille six cents tentes. Il y eut une grande bataille pres de Hamah entre quatre-vingt mille Arabes de la ligne et cent mille Wahabis, ce fut le Drayley qui l'emporta; il força ses adversaires à la fuite, et les poursuivit avec succès jusqu' aux confins du Najed. M. de Lascaris en 1802, avait donc réussi dans son mission au dela de ses désirs: mais à son retour, la fortune de Napoleon avait bien changé. C'etait le moment ou la grande armée, toujours victorieuse, operait en retraite de Moscow. M. de Lascaris . . . mourut de douleurs, &c.

† Lady Hester Stanhope was the eldest daughter of the 3rd Earl of Stanhope (celebrated for his mechanical genius and scientific researches) by his marriage, with the eldest daughter of the Earl of Chatham. Lady Hester was born 12th of March, 1776. She died at Djoun, near Sidon, in Syria, the 23rd of Dec., 1839, in her 64th year.

political affairs of Syria, was in the preservation of the Emir Bechir's wife and children, just before the last battle, in which the Sheik was defeated." Vol ii. p. 236.

The only reference to the Wahabis, which Lady Hester ever made in her conversation with me, was on one occasion, when speaking of the belief of the Arabs in the malign and benign influence of particular stars, she said: "The prince of the Wahabis always wore a large jasper under his ham."

CHAPTER XVII.

Sultan Mahmoud II.—Egypt and Mohammed Ali.

1805—1849.

THE population of Egypt in the time of the Pharaohs is supposed to have amounted to at least seven millions. Under Amasis the people of Egypt were estimated at nearly seven millions, who inhabited, it is said twenty thousand towns and villages. In the time of the Ptolemies the capital teemed with people.

Where are now the six hundred thousand inhabitants of Alexandria? What mighty change has come over the Emporium of the East, the seat of empire and centre of civilization? Where are the porticos and galleries of the Alexandrian library? Where is the evidence of the architectural marvels of the four thousand palaces of the temple of Serapis.

Time—with its four thousand years of terrible experience, of vicissitudes and revolutions, various dominations and subjugations, ravages of war and pestilence, successive governmental systems of rapine and oppression, conquests by Semites, Ethiopians, Persians, Macedonians, Romans, and Greeks of the Lower Empire, Arabs, Turks, and Mamelukes, and the rebel Pacha of our own times, has left no enduring footprints on the soil of Egypt, but vestiges of wrecked ambition, ruined greatness, overthrown pride, and downcast superstitions of various priesthoods, in mouldering monuments of stupendous magnitude, pyramids of upwards of three thousand nine hundred

years of existence,* obelisks, palaces, and temples, that were in being when Herodotus was a traveller in the land of Egypt, then, even, an old country.

Ah, there are other subsisting monuments in Egypt; records not in stone, nor embalmed in tombs, or books, but written in flesh—of rapacious tyranny of Turkish rulers, of Mohammed Ali and his successors; signs and tokens of grinding oppression, and grievous injustice, in the faces of the poor occupiers of the land, visible marks and traces of existing misery in the squalid forms, furrowed features, and haggard looks of the predial inhabitants, subdued to such lowliness as to be almost incapable of further depression and degradation. Everywhere such marks and traits of oppression, such signs and tokens of debasement and wretchedness are manifest, in the remnant of that population of ancient Egypt; of seven millions of people now dwindled down to two millions, in that last and worst stage of abject subjection and misery, in which mind and body, soul and spirit, are alike debased by bad government, and all the brutalizing influences of rapacious Turkish rule.

But I have offended against the dicta of commercial philosophers, the doctrines of political economists, in thus expressing myself. The agriculture of Egypt has been largely extended by Mohammed Ali and his successors: the exports and imports have been prodigiously increased; Alexandria has more than quadrupled its *Frank* population in the last thirty years. The houses have become palaces of consuls and Frank merchants, and brokers, jobbers, and speculators of all kinds in that great Emporium of Commerce. What does it matter how the people of the soil have fared at the hands of their task masters? All that it imports to our Frank consuls and merchants who live in splendour in Alexandria, to know, is, that fortunes are to be made by encouraging the rulers of Egypt to proceed in the great work of reform and civilization, that Mohammed Ali initiated

* Sir Gardiner Wilkinson dates the building of the Pyramids at Ghiza, about the year 2160 B.C., or six hundred and twenty-five years before the Exodus of the Israelites—say 3920 years ago.

monopolizing the commerce and produce of the country by way of promoting the renovation and regeneration of it: expecting thus to improve a state by reducing its inhabitants to abject misery.

Will people of sense and sound judgment, who believe in Christ and his gospel, ever have the courage to stand forth, and set their faces, and lift their voices against the specious sophisms, the solemn platitudes, the Godless sentiments, the sordid views, and covert falsehood of those mammon worshippers, whose religion is a belief in the dogmas that pass for orthodox respectable opinions, in consulates, the counting house, the banks, on change, and in the press that is devoted to those interests which are connected with money making pursuits, as those only worthy of prosecution?

A mighty change has, indeed come over the land of Egypt. When I first visited that country, thirty-five years ago, Mohammed Ali, who was then nominally Pacha of Egypt, had extended his dominion to Nubia, Dongola, and Sennaar, to the Hedjaz of Arabia. When I visited Egypt in 1840, he was lord and master of Palestine and Syria, and that portion of Asia Minor south of Mount Taurus. When I visited Egypt in 1860, his son and degenerate successor, Said Pacha, was the precarious possessor of Egypt alone, not the independent sovereign of that land, but a governor of it, in virtue of a firman from the sultan, which it is in the power of that sultan at any hour to recall.

No people on the face of the earth have been so long and so barbarously used by their governors as the people of Egypt. We may pass over the relations that we find in history of their miserable condition in the time of the Pharaohs, the Persians, the Ptolemies, the Romans, the Saracens, and find a sufficient confirmation of that statement in the authentic accounts that are given of the oppression they have groaned under at the hands of Turks and Mamelukes, and perhaps of the most exacting and remorseless taskmaster of all, Mohammed Ali.*

* Peter Martyr, an author, who wrote of Egypt in the 16th century, and who died in 1560, of whose writings Washington Irving says, "They are rich in

A portion of the following accounts of Mohammed Ali's origin and career—of the massacre especially of the Mamelukes, and the war with the Wahabis, was published by me in 1830, in a work where the information of the kind it contains was not calculated to attract public attention. Nevertheless I do not believe in the interval of thirty years that has elapsed since the publication, that any work, treating of Egypt, has appeared in which more authentic details—nay, an equal amount of such authentic details is to be met with, relative to Moham-

thought, but still richer in fact, and full of urbanity," draws a frightful picture of the wretched condition of the people of Egypt in his time.

"Gens autem ipsa incolarum est imbellis, effæminata, inermis, discincta, mollis, timida; mechanichis tantum artibus aut mercaturae intenta: vitam silentio præterit ingloriam. Nec alüs legibus, à Mameluchis gubernata, quàm absoluto judicio. Est præterea Mameluchi cujusvis, tanta in incolas universos potestas, ut clavâ lignéâ, quam manu gestat semper, quemcunque incolam obvium ferire pro libito, vel levissimâ occasione sumptâ, liceat: quod scilicet ipsum transeuntem tetigerit, aut venienti non assurrexerit, vel minus honorifice salutaverit, aut non citus loco cesserit. Interdum etiam nullam nactus causam, dum aut temulentus aut insanus vel aliâs iratus incedens per urbem Mameluchus occurrit incolae, ipsum quotquot ictibus libet percutit, nec mussitare miser audet, neque in ejus auxilium vel labium movere quisquam intentat: quamvis pater filium aut filius patrem à Mamelucho cœdi conspiciat, æquo tamen vultu patiatur, necesse est. . . . . Incolae cuiquam arma ulla, vel gladiolum quidem acutâ cuspidite vel rectâ, apud se habere, equo vel pedibus ambulanti, vetitum est. Redituum autem, præter ordinaria vectigalia, lex est—principum voluntas. Exigunt, expilant. extorquent, et ad ossa usque excoriant. Propterea, etsi animus ad vindicandum se in libertatem à tam impiâ servitute adesset, vires tamen deficet rent: cum pecuniae, quae sunt nervi belli, illis desint; exercitique minime sinarmis. . . . . Voluptatibus omnifariam dediti, futurorum omni curà posthabità, vivunt; suoque Mohometae se magis gratum facere tunc arbitrantur, quando ardentius delectationibus incumbunt.

"Judicate igitur, serenissimi reges, quàm infausto sydere regiones hae gubernentur, in quibns servi dominantur, liberi serviunt, graves opprimuntur, stulti extolluntur; ubi nulla fides, nullam jus, nulla pietas, misericordia rara, avaritia immensa; in domibus summa ob multas uxores discordia, foris ingens inter se odium."*

Blount, in his "Voyage to the Levant," published nearly two centuries ago gives a similar description of the results of Turkish rule in Egypt. The abject condition of the Egyptian fellahs, the grinding rapacity of all the functionaries of the government are set forth in almost similar terms in his work:—

"Now the Turk, to break the spirits of this people the more, oppresses them with a heavier poverty than any of his other Mohammedan subjects; and, therefore, if there be one vizier more ravenous than another, he sends him thither, and connives at all his extortions, though afterwards, according to the Turkish policy, he knows not how to squeeze him into the treasury, so satisfying the people, the prince drains them, and they discern him no otherwise than as their revenger."

* Legatio Babylonica, Lib. iii. fol. 84.

med's early career, and that terrible episode of it—the destruction of the Mamelukes. The principal part of these details are from original sources—from accounts given me by Turks long settled in Egypt, some who had served with Mohammed Ali in his military career, and under him at the time of the massacre of the Mamelukes, and also by Greeks of Salonica, who had known Mohammed Ali's early history, and first steps to power and greatness.

Mohammed Ali, the late viceroy of Egypt, was born in Cavalè, a town in Roumelia, the year of the Hegira, eleven hundred and eighty two (A.D. 1769). His father was chief of the patrol, who preserved the security of the public roads.

At an early age he became a servant to a Choarbagi of Cavalè, who noticed the energy of his character, and the assiduity he uniformly manifested. In a little time Mohammed Ali was not only in the favour of his master, but, what was of no less importance, in the good graces of his harem likewise. The first act of his public life was one of those well planned stratagems which Turks call generalship and Franks perfidy; but, whatever be the name, it was one of those plausible artifices which have since formed the principal feature in the political character of the wily Pacha.

A neighbouring village, having refused to pay tribute, Mohammed Ali asked permission of his master to bring the delinquents before him. It was in vain that the Choarbagi represented the impossibility of doing so; of his having no adequate force to send against the village, whose inhabitants were renowned for their audacity. Mohammed Ali was not to be put from his purpose; he demanded six soldiers, and with this number he set out for the village. Having posted his little force so as to excite no suspicion, he entered a mosque, and having performed his *namez* with great devotion in the face of the Imam, he despatched him to request the presence of the four principal men of the place, in order to communicate something of great importance to their private fortunes. The unsuspecting grandees came to the house of God; a signal

brought the soldiers to the door—the men were seized, bound, and carried off, before the Imam had time to raise his townsmen.

For this feat of valour the young hero was made a *Bajouk Bashi* (captain of irregulars), and in the course of a little time was married to a rich widow, a relative of his master, by whom he has three sons—Ibrahim, Toussoun, and Ismael. (His son, Said, the present Viceroy, born in 1822, and his youngest son, Mohammed Ali, born in 1825, were by other wives.) He now turned his thoughts to commerce, and in the capacity of a tobacco merchant, he frequently associated with the Franks of Salonica, and in their society he acquired those *Giaour* notions, which ever after influenced his conduct. In the meantime, the French having taken possession of Egypt, the Sublime Porte took up the sword of Islam, and troops were raised in the provinces.

The Choarbagi of Salonica got a firman to furnish a contingent of three hundred men, a command which was executed with no little difficulty. The son of the Choarbagi was appointed captain of the troop; but the privations of the voyage, and the difficulties the armies encountered at Aboukir, disgusted the young commander; he quitted the service, and gave up the command to Mohammed Ali, who took the title of Bynbashi (colonel). In the first battle with "the infidels," the Moslems had the advantage—notwithstanding our young hero lost a great number of his men: but he had the good fortune to be observed by the Captain Pacha, in the act of rallying his troop, and was recommended for his bravery to the notice of Kousruf Pacha, and ultimately placed under his orders. Having signalised himself on many occasion, he eventually got the title of Sarè Chesmè, after the massacre of the Beys in the camp of Aboukir, an exploit in which he had his share of honor.

Kourshid Pacha was at that time the viceroy of the country, nominated by the Porte, but only sustained in his government by a horde of Albanians, one of whose chiefs was Mohammed Ali. With this force, little as the Pacha could rely on it, he

kept the Mamelukes without the walls of the city but they spread devastation in the adjoining country, and pitched their camps without molestation in sight of the citadel. Mohammed Ali resolved to attack them: as usual, he had recourse to strategem; he wrote to three Beys—Osman, Hassan, and Elfi, to prevent the suspicion of his intention, that he was aware of the wrongs they had to complain of, and that unless the Pacha listened to their remonstrances, he meant to join their side. Duped by this artifice, the Beys were thrown off their guard. Their Turkish enemies, a thousand strong, entered their camp at midnight; Elfi was surprised in bed, but the enterprise was so unskilfully managed, that he and his Mamelukes escaped. The baggage and five heads only were carried away by the victor.

The Pacha presented him with a pelisse, and at the same time with a firman from the Sultan, ordering him to leave the country. He affected to prepare for his departure, which he fixed for that day two months. The Pacha, deceived by his apparent willingness to obey the mandate, overwhelmed him with civilities; and, to rid himself of his presence, during the period of his remaining in Egypt, he appointed him governor of Girgeh, for which place he immediately set out.

To supplant the Albanians, the Pacha caused a corps of Delhis to come from Syria. This measure was so displeasing to Mohammed Ali, that he immediately returned to Cairo from his government with all his soldiers. He put the Delhis to route, who guarded the gates of the city, made a triumphant entry, and demanded the pay of his soldiers, under the very walls of the citadel. The Pacha in vain declaimed against his insubordination, and forbade the authorities to hold any intercourse with the rebel, but the rebel was everywhere felicitated.

On his arrival in the capital, he had gained a well-earned reputation for moderation, as well as courage, and the people looked to him as the only one capable of checking the disorders of the soldiery; of the Delhis especially, who ravaged the whole town, and violated even the sanctity of the harem. The people

were not deceived; they found a protector in Mohammed Ali; he repressed the insolence of the new troops, offered protection to the Franks, and even made friends of the Ulemas and Sheiks.

When Kourshid found Mohammed Ali had no intention of obeying the mandate of the Sultan, he procured another firman appointing him to the Pachalik of Jedda. He invited him to the citadel to invest him with the robe of dignity, but Mohammed Ali was too well acquainted with treachery to intrust himself in the house of his enemy—he refused to go. After some days' discussion, it was agreed that he should meet the viceroy at the house of a man whose faith he could depend on, and accordingly they met at the divan of Seid Aga, a mutual friend. The firman was read, and the young Pacha of Jedda was invested with the pelisse and kaouk of honour.

The suburbs of the city were still ravaged by the Delhis; the Sheiks, or chiefs of the people, complained to the Cadi; the people themselves cried out for the deposition of Kourshid Pacha, while the partisans of Mohammed Ali demanded his nomination to the viceregal office. But what proved the address of the young adventurer, more than any other circumstance of his life, was this, that he was so subtle in persuasion, and tempered resolution with so much moderation, that he gained the hearts of all classes, and for once in Egypt, the Ulemas and the rabble were heard shouting for the appointment of the same governor.

Two of his partisans, Seid Omar Makram, and Sheik Abdallah Cherkaouy, assembled a divan, and in the presence of the people, they invested Mohammed Ali with the robe of viceroy, and proclaimed him Pacha of Egypt.

A deputation of sheiks was sent to Kourshid to inform him of his deposition. He laughed at the beards of the messengers and dismissed them with the assurance that till it was the will of the Sultan to depose him, he would never leave the citadel. The citadel was accordingly besieged by the newly appointed governor, and many weeks passed over without his gaining any

advantage; at length, during the siege, a capidgi-bashi arrived from Stamboul, bearing a firman, confirming the election of the people in favour of Mohammed Ali, as Governor of Egypt (9th July, 1805).

Kourshid refused to acknowledge the firman. "He was appointed viceroy," he said, "by a hatti-sheriff, and by a hatti-sheriff only would he give up his office." In the interim the Capitan Pacha arrived before Alexandria, with his fleet, to second Mohammed Ali, and Kourshid being eventually driven from Egypt, the young viceroy was left in quiet possession of his throne.

The first act of his government was a financial stratagem, which replenished the exhausted coffers of the State, without distressing the people generally. He arrested the chief of the treasury, Gohary, on the pretence that he had furnished no account to his predecessors for the last five years; he demanded an account, the items of which he himself specified, and forced him to refund four thousand eight hundred purses. The Mamelukes were still in possession of Upper Egypt, and even had a camp under the walls of Cairo. The Pacha was justly desirous to get rid of their annoyance. A fool, or a Frank, would think he would have met his enemies in the open field of battle, and in the face of heaven; but, of course, Mohammed Ali committed no such folly. As usual, he had recourse to stratagem (the Beys said to treachery), and his plan succeeded. He caused a report to be spread abroad that the festival of the Kalege, or cutting of the canal which lets in the water of the Nile into the great square of the city, would be celebrated with more than ordinary splendour; and that the public authorities, and all the troops should be assembled on the spot during the night of the *fantasia*. He also ordered several of his principal officers to write letters to the Beys, informing them of the favourable opportunity which the withdrawal of the troops from the heart of the city would afford the enemies of the Pacha for entering the town by the gates most distant from the Kalege, and likewise offering to abet them in their enterprise for a cer-

tain sum of money, to be paid on their establishment in Cairo. The stratagem was seconded by a letter from the Pacha's friend, Omar, who represented himself as a disgraced favourite, and a sworn foe to the Pacha. He advised the Beys to surprise the city during the festival, and to make his house their rallying point.

I have heard this stratagem coolly discussed on its merits—those of its success—and extolled.

In open warfare, Mohammed Ali was rarely successful; in deceit he hardly ever failed. The night of the festival arrived: the dyke of the canal cut: the Mamelukes broke open the gates, and entered the city, unopposed, with beat of drum. But suddenly the soldiers of the Pacha appeared on all sides; the Mamelukes were fired on from the roof and windows of every house in the quarter. They fled in the utmost disorder; many were fortunate enough to escape, by abandoning their horses and scaling the city walls, but the greater number were massacred in the streets. Some of the unfortunates, amongst whom was Achmet Bey, sought refuge in a mosque, but no place was too holy for the vengeance of Mohammed Ali; the poor wretches were dragged forth, stripped of their fine Mameluke attire, bound with cords, and dragged before the Pacha.

The moment the latter set eyes on the humbled figure of Achmet Bey, whom he had personally known in the days of his splendour, his vulgar features brightened up with satisfaction. 'What!' said he, 'has so clever a man as Achmet Bey fallen into the trap?' The fallen Bey replied not to the question. He begged the guard to bring him a draught of water; his hands were loosened to allow him to raise the bardak to his mouth, but suddenly relinquishing the water-vessel, he seized on a short sword of one of the soldiers who stood near him, and hurled it at the breast of the Pacha. Mohammed Ali escaped the blow by stooping to the earth, and avoided the possibility of another by flying to the roof of the palace, while the unfortunate Bey was cut to pieces by the soldiers, after wounding several of his assailants. The other prisoners were thrown into a dungeon:

the following day, being led into the court-yard of the prison, butchers were sent for to act as executioners, and in the presence of the captives, many heads of their chiefs and companions were chopped off, skinned, and stuffed with straw.*

The day of the festival was a day of mourning in El Masr: the dyke was cut by the servants of the Pacha, but the people took no part in the *fantasia*—nobody thought about rejoicings, but everyone talked of the massacre. Mohammed Ali followed up his victories by sending an army against Ibrahim Bey, and his son Marsouk, who were encamped under Gebel Mokattam. But the expedition was an unfortunate one; the Mamelukes behaved with such determined courage, that a third of the Pacha's army was left dead on the field, the remainder fled to Cairo in the utmost disorder. The viceroy's exasperation was fatal to the few unfortunate Mameluke prisoners, who were confined in a dungeon beneath his palace. The state of suspense in which they had been left since the night of their capture, was put an end to by the sudden appearance of their guard, armed with naked hanjars. The work of blood began: one after another the prisoners were cut down, and the following day eighty three heads were stuffed and sent to Stamboul. But all the blood of the Beys could not bring money into the exhausted treasury of the viceroy.

The properties of the rich were confiscated—contributions were levied on the Greeks and Copts—and in Damietta the Jews were publicly tortured to make them confess their wealth. A new stratagem was tried to get the Beys of Upper Egypt to return to the capital; the Pacha sent presents of great value to the chiefs, and made offers of peace, which were rejected with scorn. In the mean time seventy Tartars arrived from Stamboul, bearing the three horse-tails of the Pachalik, and a hatti-sheriff confirming the viceroy in his government. After the public rejoicings on this occasion, another army was sent against Elfy Bey, which met with the same fate as a former one.

* From "The Mussulman," by R R. Madden. London: 1830.vol. iii. p. 20.

Elfy, emboldened by his victory, pushed his success to the very walls of the capital. The English considered him an ally, and many efforts were made in Constantinople to get the Porte to restore him to favor. They succeeded. The Capitan Pacha arrived in Alexandria with a numerous fleet, and a force of three thousand Nizam Jedids, to establish the Beys conjointly with Moussa Pacha, in the government of Egypt. Mohammed Ali, received a firman from the Sultan, commanding him to quit Egypt and repair to Salonica, of which place he was appointed Pacha. Mohammed Ali kissed the firman, but he showed no alacrity in obeying it. The Capitan Pacha dispatched another Capidgi-bashi, with orders to bring the viceroy or his head to Stamboul. The viceroy refused to see the messenger; but he sent word by him to his master, that he was ready to leave Egypt, but that his troops would not suffer him to depart till he had paid their arrears, which amounted to two thousand purses. The messenger was no sooner dismissed, than he commenced putting the city in a state of defence—he garrisoned the citadel, and provisioned it for a long siege. The marvellous activity of his preparations surprised even the Franks, who, in the opinion of the Turks and Egyptians, seem born to be always hurrying from one place to another, bustling continually, and blown about like so many grains of sand in a whirlwind, tossed to and fro, without any sense of dignity, or knowledge of the value and blessedness of repose.

The Beys were expected to second the Capitan Pacha, in displacing Mohammed Ali, their inplacable enemy; but their disunion and dissensions frustrated the hopes of relying on their aid. Elfi, however, with his wonted liberality, sent a present to the Capitan Pacha, worthy of a Mameluke to offer, and a prince to accept: it consisted of thirty Arab horses, richly caparisoned, four thousand sheep, and a hundred camels, laden with provisions, and splendid dresses for the officers of the admiral. The Capitan Pacha sent in return a present of two mortars, five hundred guns, and other munitions of war. Another order arrived from the Capitan Pacha for the im-

mediate departure of Mohammed Ali, and an announcement of the pardon accorded by the Sultan to the Mamelukes. When the viceroy read that imperative command, he turned to one of his confidential friends and said, "I have won El Maser by the sword, and only by the sword will I cede it. Egypt is now at auction, and he who gives the last blow of the sabre will be the master."

About this period another unfortunate battle with the Beys at Negyleh, lost him six hundred men. Had there been any unanimity amongst the victors, Mohammed Ali's ruin was inevitable; but it was in vain the Capitan Pacha waited, week after week, for their general co-operation, till at last, disgusted with their dissensions, he turned over all at once to the side of Mohammed Ali. Having written to the Porte announcing the state of things in the country, a firman arrived, with the consent of the Sultan to leave the present Pacha in his government, provided he paid four thousand purses for being confirmed in his dignity, supplied the annual caravan of pilgrims with money and provisions, and ceased to make war on the Mamelukes. The terms were accepted. The son of the viceroy, Ibrahim, was sent to Stamboul as a hostage, for the payment of the money; and in a short time after, a contribution was levied on the wives of the Beys, and on the Christian merchants, of six thousand purses.

On the rumour of Russia declaring war with the Porte, the fleet of the Capitan Pacha weighed anchor, and Alexandria was left in quiet possession of the viceroy. One of the bravest of the Beys, Osman Bardissy, died about this time. His death was lamented by all except the Pacha. His servants killed his horses before his tent, and then broke his arms over his tomb, the greatest honor that could be paid to his remains. But Elfy the Great, the most formidable of all the enemies of the Pacha, was taken off shortly after the death of Bardissy, probably by poison—the Pacha had a long hand. The strength of the Beys was now broken; the two greatest of their chiefs were taken from them. The viceroy became more successful

than he had been in every succeeding encounter with them. He found little difficulty in deceiving the chiefs, having brought over the Bedouin troops who guarded their camp: he proposed an armistice, which was partly accepted, when he surprised their camp at night, at the head of two thousand horsemen, fell on the sleeping wretches, and slew three hundred of them before a sword of theirs was unsheathed.

The rejoicings for this *victory* were interrupted by the intelligence that an English fleet, of twenty-five sail, had arrived in Alexandria (17th of March, 1807); that five thousand English had landed, and taken possession of the city without firing a shot. The inquietude in Cairo was very great, but the next news put an end to the consternation. The English were beaten at Rosetta by the Turks, and a hundred and twenty prisoners were brought to the Pacha. Two regiments of the English made the attempt on Rosetta. They arrived after a fatiguing march across the desert—they were suffered to enter the town without opposition; they strolled in separate parties about the bazaars; many of them abandoned their arms, and were reposing in the shade eating and drinking, when the governor, Ali Bey, at the head of five hundred men, suddenly appeared. In an instant every house became a fortress, from the windows and terraces of which death was poured on the invaders. Their general was killed, confusion ensued, and in the course of half an hour the streets were strewed with the enemies of the prophet. Instead of pursuing the survivors, the victorious Moslems commenced cutting off the heads of the slain, and wrangling for the possession of the captives, who were sent to Cairo in the same boat with the heads of their companions, ninety of which were subsequently placed on spears, and stuck up in the great square in Cairo, of the Ezbekia. The Turks could not understand what the English meant by coming in so small a number, and in so strange a manner; no one knew why they came, or what could be expected from such an expedition. The commanders did not know themselves; the fortress was well garrisoned, yet they

counted on victory as if they had nothing else to expect; the dinner was cooked for the general and his staff in the house of the consul, but it was decreed that Ali Bey and his officers should eat it. The English were not satisfied with their defeat; they sent another army, three times more numerous than the former, against El Raschid, the modern Rosetta. The Pacha sent five thousand men, under Hassan Pacha, to beat them again. The town was bombarded, another battle was fought, the Turks lost a couple of hundred men, but the victory was theirs. New prisoners were sent to El Masr, and as they passed through the great square, they had to traverse an alley where four hundred and fifty heads were ranged on either side. But with all this glory the Pacha had need of repose, the coffers of the State were empty; several Beys were still to be vanquished, and there was no fighting without money.

He sent a deputation of sheiks to the Mamelukes, accompanied by a present of great value for their chiefs, inviting them to return to their homes in Cairo, and promising pardon for the past, and protection for the future. The offer was accepted; all the principal Beys returned with their numerous followers to the capital, and were well received. The propitious star of Mohammed Ali was now rising in the heavens. The English evacuated Alexandria; the prisoners were given up; their fleet left the harbour; and Moslems say, nobody can tell what they came for.*

The Mamelukes of Egypt, its conquerors and possessors, were originally slaves. From the time of the Moguls, a slave trade had been carried on with the Caucassian tribes of Georgia and Circassia. Those markets supplied the Turks with slaves, who carried them to Egypt, and there, when they overpowered their masters, they perpetuated their dominion by means of the natives of the Caucasus, slaves like themselves, and of their own race.

"During the 500 or 600 years," says Volney, "that there

* From "The Mussulman," by R. M. Madden, vol. iii. p. 32.

have been Mamelukes in Egypt, not one of them has left subsisting issue; there does not exist one single family of them in the second generation; all their children perish in the first and second descent. The means, therefore, by which they are perpetuated and multiplied, were of necessity, the same by which they were first established.

"Born, for the most part in the rites of the Greek Church, and circumcised the moment they are bought, they are considered by the Turks themselves, as renegades, void of faith and of religion. Strangers to each other, they are not bound by those natural ties which unite the rest of mankind. Without parents, without children, the past has nothing to do for them, and they do nothing for the future. Ignorant and superstitious from education, they become ferocious from the murders they commit, and corrupted by the most horrible debauchery. On the other hand they have every sort of incentive and teaching to prompt them to rapacity and lawlessness. The young peasant, sold in Mingrelia or Georgia, no sooner arrives in Egypt, than his ideas undergo a total alteration. A new and extraordinary scene opens before him, where everything conduces to awaken his audacity and ambition. Though now a slave, he seems destined to become a master, and already assumes the spirit of his future condition. No sooner is a slave enfranchised than he aspires to the principal employments; and who is to oppose his pretensions? and he will be no less able than his betters in the art of governing, which consists only in taking money, and giving blows with the sabre."

When Mohammed Ali planned and executed his great atrocity, the perfidious, cold blooded massacre of the Mameluke Beys, their retainers and adherents in Egypt amounted to about 8,500.

Thus we find that in Egypt Mohammed Ali had signalised himself, first in the conflicts between the rival Beys; and afterwards between the Beys and the Turkish Pachas. The military aristocracy of the Mamelukes was too strong for the Pachas, who were the nominal governors of Egypt, so that the country

was in a continued state of ferment between the pretensions of ambitious soldiers, and the intrigues of powerless governors. Mohammed Ali took advantage of the moment, proclaimed himself Pacha, and took possession of Cairo.

The Sultan denied not his authority; as usual, he winked at usurpation which he was unable to control; and perhaps was not displeased to see any Pacha, self nominated or not, on the throne of Egypt, who was capable of curbing the lawless Mamelukes. But when the perfidious Porte thought the usurper long enough installed in his government to have collected treasure, his ruin was determined on, and every means was tried to get rid of him. But Mohammed Ali was too wily for the Porte; he defeated its clumsy attempts, without affecting to perceive them; he sent his tribute with the most solemn assurance of fidelity to the Sultan, the humblest of whose slaves he affected to appear. The Sultan was not deceived: he received the tribute of the Giaour Pacha (for such Mohammed Ali was called in Constantinople by the faithful, on account of his intercourse with Christians) but his head was still wanted to adorn the gate of the Seraglio.

Mohammed Ali was now firmly fixed in his government, and it was evident that something more than Turkish wisdom preserved him in it. Telegraphs were established from Alexandria to Cairo, and every insurrection which began was disconcerted in the space of a few hours. The Mamelukes deemed his agents supernatural, but his principal agent was M. Drovetti, the French consul, whose prudence and dexterity were mainly instrumental in seating Mohammed Ali on the throne. Every important measure of State of the latter was of his planning, and the viceroy well knows that to him the success of his ambition was mainly due.

Drovetti was one of the most perfect courtiers in his manners and appearance, I ever met; his quiet, winning, and elegant address, was not more remarkable than his profound astuteness and his powers of dissimulation. There was, however, something exceedingly unpleasing in his countenance, and as he

stalked along the plain of Alexandria, every evening, muffled up in his white *bernous*, the Franks were seen to make way with a sort of deferential fear, and some have been heard to whisper as he passed, "Make way for Cataline."

What share he had in the destruction of the Mamelukes, I know not; but in his quality of privy counsellor, it is to be presumed the bloody business was not transacted without his knowledge.

The Franks of Alexandria in general did not question the expediency of the massacre of the Mamelukes. They rather approved of the policy which dictated that energetic measure, and reasoned on it á la Turque. The Mamelukes or Mohammed Ali must have fallen, the viceroy determined it should be the former. He therefore invited them to a grand feast, said to be given in honour of his son, at the citadel, and for the alleged purpose of a reconciliation with the Beys, for whom it was reported he had prepared magnificent presents. The Mamelukes distrusted the Pacha's sudden friendship; they had resolved not to attend the banquet. The emissaries of the Pacha laboured to convince them that their suspicion was unfounded, and they prevailed, at last, on the generous-minded Mamelukes (for such they were) to trust to the honour and hospitality of Mohammed Ali.

The 1st of March, 1811, one of the most successful acts of perfidy ever attempted even in Turkey, was performed by Mohammed Ali, the Satrap of modern Egypt. The Mamelukes ascended the citadel, Chakyn Bey, at the head of his house, was the first to dismount at the door of the palace. Osman, Ibrahim, Mazzouk, and all the other chiefs appeared in succession, with their numerous followers, splendidly attired. Never was there a nobler cavalcade beheld, than that which was now seen from the windows of the palace, winding slowly along the steep avenues of the citadel; their bright swords glittering in the sun, their embroidered garments radiant with gold and silver, and the gorgeous accoutrements of their Arab steeds dazzling the eyes of the spectators. It was a glorious spectacle to all,

except to those who had the present before their eyes in the same vista with the future. The Pacha condescended to rise at the entrance of the Beys, and when the principal guests were seated, he placed his hand on his left breast and salaamed them all round.

"May the peace of God be on you (were his words), you are welcome to my house; this is truly a day of happiness; I have no more enemies in the world; all my dear friends are about me; they love me, I am now assured. Allah be their recompense! they are my dutiful children, my affectionate brothers, my excellent friends, praised be the apostle!"

The Beys said they had lived to see a blessed day, a day of peace and reconciliation. They thanked God for having an opportunity of paying homage to their prince; and they desired no greater honour than to bask in the sunshine of his favour, and no higher pleasure than to walk in the shadow of his glory.

There was no end to their protestations of love and loyalty. The Pacha, on the other hand was not to be outdone in courtesy. He played 'the most kind host,' to perfection. He assured them generally, they might count on his protection; he spoke to them individually about their affairs and families; nothing could exceed his affability. To Chakyn Bey he spoke of his skill in lancing the jereed. He talked to Osman Bey of his dexterity in wielding the sword; of his cutting a helmet through and through with a single stroke. To Ibrahim's mind he recalled the days of his youth; how he stuck on the back of his spirited steed as if the horse and the rider were one. He made the tears come to the old man's eyes, when he spoke of his bright bay steed, from whose shining back, in the words of hyperbolical eulogy, the trappings slid, as the dewdrops glide down the sides of slippery marble; a horse ready in turning, quick in pursuing, bold in advancing, firm in backing, and performing every evolution with strength and swiftness.

The refreshments were handed round. Some of the Beys kept sipping their coffee, without daring to swallow it. Mo-

hammed Ali observed their suspicions, but he affected not to notice them. Toussoon, the son of the Pacha, was now presented to the company—a handsome youth, about seventeen years of age; a fine, frank-face boy, the very reverse in disposition, as well as in appearance, of his scowling brother Ibrahim. Every one admired the manly, open features of the little hero, who at so early an age was entrusted with the command of eight thousand men. The ceremony was now performed of investing him with the pelisse of Pacha, and reading the firman. This being done, the guests rose to depart. The public square in the town was to be the place of the sports of the jereed, and the luti, or wrestling. The Pacha stood up as they retired, the highest honour it was possible to confer on inferiors. He smiled and smiled over again, as one after another departed, but murder was busy with his heart, and all the blood of his veins seemed to have collected and curdled there, for his lips and cheek, it is said, were as pale as ashes.

The visit was finished; a confidential agent performed the office of master of the ceremonies; he assigned to each the order of his departure. A corps of Delhis opened the march under Ouzam Ali; then came the Janissary Aga, with the Adaklys and Yoldaches, and then followed the guests. Whilst they were mounting their horses, the confidential agent dispatched his soldiers to the different gates to see that they were shut, and kept so till further orders should be given.

The Mamelukes were now mounted on their high-couraged horses, prancing and curvetting as they returned by the same avenue by which they came. They proceeded through the path leading to the square of Roumelia, and when they came to that narrow part where the road is cut in the solid rock, and where more than five or six cannot pass abreast, the agent appeared on the walls above, crying with a voice of thunder to the soldiers around him, 'Kill! kill!' Instantly a discharge of musketry was poured on the astonished Mamelukes. They pressed on one another so thickly in attempting to get to the gates through the narrow avenue, that the passage was soon

blocked up, both with the dead and the living. At length some of them made their way to the gates, but they found them closed. He who had charge of this post, Saleh Kosh, and a troop of Delhis, were stationed on the walls and turrets overhead, keeping up a continual fire on the poor wretches during their fruitless endeavours to break open the doors. As the survivors fled, they galloped over the dead bodies of their comrades, their horses maddened with wounds, and they themselves confounded and dismayed by the groans of their companions, the yells of the savage soldiery, and the incessant roar of musketry.

The unfortunate Beys now abandoned their horses, they stripped themselves of their cumbrous garments, and sword in hand, returned to the threshold of the palace. But all along the path the soldiers were stationed on the heights, taking unerring aim at their defenceless victims; and when in their despair they rushed to the door of the palace, a thousand muskets were levelled at them from the loopholes and latices. The carnage was terrible. The Beys in vain shook their swords at their murderers. They ran up and down like distracted beings, bleeding and half naked, walking over the bodies of the dying and dead, and every instant increasing the heaps of their slaughtered companions.

Parties of the soldiers now descended from the walls to dispatch the survivors, some of whom had taken refuge in the ruins of Saladin's palace.

The spirit of the Mamelukes was at length broken; many were dragged from the ruins and massacred without offering any resistance; but some, amongst whom were Chakyn and Osman Beys, died like men deserving a better fate, and when they fell it was on the bodies of their enemies.*

During the massacre the Pacha was not to be seen; but the murderous business was beheld by him from first to last, from his place of security in a small turret in the citadel. He witnessed the effects of the galling fire of musketry, from the surround-

* "The Mussulman," by R. R. Madden, vol. iii. pp. 104—111.

ing parapets, on his victims in the narrow pass, leading to the chief entrance; he was gazing on them when they found there was no escape for them; when they looked their murderers in the face; when they called for quarter, and there was no mercy for them; when they shook their swords at their assassins, but when they and the chief murderer were beyond their reach.

A soldier who had assisted at the massacre, informed me, (fourteen years after that occurrence), that the poor wretches in their despair kept running to and fro, from one door to another, vainly seeking an exit, a place of safety, until there was not a single Mameluke left standing. The greater number were dispatched, but many were only wounded; when the ferocious soldiers descended from the walls, and cut and hacked the expiring Beys. I said to the soldier, "It must have been a dreadful sight?" He said it was very sad to see such fine clothes as they were dressed in, spoiled with blood!

The Pacha, it will be imagined, must have been moved at this awful spectacle, may have looked with horror perhaps at this slaughter of his guests, and felt, when the deed was done, all the agonies of remorse. Oh, no; in those oriental regions where power is vigorously and rigorously exercised by the Turks, when policy aims a blow of this kind, and perfidy plays the host, or the friend, on any similar murderous occasion, as much glory redounds to the contriver of a plot to kill unsuspecting parties, from the successful stratagem and slaughter, as accrues to the European soldier from his triumphs on the field of battle.

The number of the Mamelukes killed in the citadel, is generally supposed to have been from three to five hundred. Sir Gardner Wilkinson says 480 were slain in the citadel, and subsequently throughout the country, 1,400. Turner estimates the number slain at Cairo at eight hundred. One only of the Beys escaped, by leaping his Arab steed over the parapet at a tremendous distance from the ground; the horse was killed, but the rider got in safety to the desert, and when I first visited Turkey, was living at Constantinople.

This bloody business, I have reason to believe, weighed heavily

at the close of life on the mind of Mohammed Ali. But more produce had been exported after the Mamelukes had been murdered; *ergo*, it was a good thing they were slain. Egypt has been tranquil since the slaughter; and the Mamelukes—

> "After life's fitful fever *they* sleep well!
> Treachery hath done its worst, nor steel, nor poison,
> Malice domestic, foreign levy, nothing
> Can touch *them* further."

In 1814, Mohammed Ali promulgated a decree, that for audacity as well as injustice, has never been exceeded, declaratory of his being the lawful possessor from that date, of the whole soil of Egypt, and that all the tillers of the soil, and heretofore owners of it, were to hold on hire, or work the land under his title, and in accordance with the terms made between him, the lord of the soil, and the people on it, his tenants.

This great measure of *reform* was applauded by the European parasites, who surrounded him, and was followed by another reform of a financial kind; he assumed the administration of all the revenues of the mosques, for pious and charitable purposes.

In 1824 the Egyptian fleet destined for the Morea, sailed from Alexandria on the expedition against Greece, commanded by Ibrahim Pacha. At this period the Porte was playing an underhand game of intrigue against Mohammed Ali, and the latter was secretly undermining the power of the Sultan in his Syrian possessions.

The expedition consisted of 16,000 infantry, and 700 cavalry, besides artillery. Ibrahim Pacha commanded; he was successful in his descent on Candia, and partially so in his operations in Greece. The Egyptian fleet, however, was soon afterwards involved in the destruction of that of Turkey, at the battle of Navarino, in 1827, and Ibrahim returned with the remains of his army to Egypt. Mohammed Ali had been promised the Pachalic of all Syria, previous to the Greek expedition, instead of which the Porte conferred on him that of Candia, which

island had not been included in the treaty for the independence of Greece.

He now devoted himself to the erection of a native fleet, and soon found himself in the possession of a formidable naval force, with dockyards and arsenal capable of maintaining it and supplying all its casualties. He knew that the Porte only waited for an opportunity to declare war against him, and he boldly flung down the gauntlet first. Abdallah, Pasha of Acre, had long been his enemy, and had lately given shelter to some Egyptian deserters, the surrender of whom was demanded by Mehemet. The Pasha of Acre refused, whereupon the viceroy of Egypt informed him laconically that "he would come and take them with *one* besides."*

In 1831 Mohammed Ali determined on the invasion of Syria, an act of Abdalla Pasha, governor of St. Jean D'Acre, his ancient enemy, was the pretence for this war against the authority of the Sultan. Ibrahim Pacha, in the above mentioned year, led an army of 24,000 infantry and 4000 cavalry against Acre. For six months he besieged Acre, and at length took that important town and its Turkish governor. Abdallah was sent a prisoner to Egypt; war was declared in all due form against the rebellious Pacha of Egypt by the Porte, and a large army sent against Ibrahim Pacha into Syria; this army Ibrahim signally defeated in 1832, at Homs.

Another Turkish army joined to the debris of the former under the Grand Vizier. Hussein Pacha was defeated by Ibrahim at Beylan, and thus a passage was opened from Mount Taurus into Turkey. A little later in the same year (1832), another victory was gained by Ibrahim over the Turks at Koniah, and the celebrated Reschid Pacha was captured by him.

In this unpleasant posture of affairs, with no available means of stopping the march to Constantinople of the Egyptian army, the aid of Russia was invoked by the ill-starred Sultan Mahmoud, and of course it was given against a Mohammedan

* Warburton Crescent and the Cross. vol. ii. p. 37.

power that could not fail to be far more formidable at Constantinople to Russia than that of the Turk. So the Ottomans were aided, and an army of 25,000 men sent to Constantinople. And the unfortunate treaty of Unkiar Skelessi was wrung from the Sultan.

Of the invasion and occupation of Syria by Mohammed Ali and his forces under Ibrahim Pacha, I have elsewhere spoken.

Egypt, under Mohammed Ali, until 1840, had been virtually independent of the Ottoman Porte. Since that period the power of the Egyptian rulers exists, in virtue of a firman from the Sultan, constituting those rulers lieutenant vassals of the Porte, paying an annual tribute of £300,000,* bearing the titles of Pachas and Viceroys of Egypt, those titles and functions being declared hereditary in the family of Mohammed Ali.

Mohammed Ali terminated his career in August, 1849, having survived his reason a few years, and his eldest son, the hero of the Hedjaz and of Syria (Ibrahim Pacha) a few months. Ibrahim died in November, 1848. When Mohammed Ali died, he had two sons living—Said Pacha, born in 1822, and Mehemet Ali, born in 1833. He was succeeded, however, by Abbas Pacha, the second eldest son of Ibrahim. On the death of Abbas Pacha, in 1854, Said Pacha (the present viceroy), fourth son of Mohammed Ali, succeeded.

FINANCES.

THE revenue in 1855 was estimated at about £3,825,000: the expenditure £3,800,000. In 1860, when I was in Egypt, the revenue was said to be raised in amount to £5,000,000. The floating debt in 1857 was about £1,400,000. The total of the importations to the Port of Alexandria, in 1858, was valued at £2,817,754. The value of the exportations from Egypt the same year was £3,635,483.

* In 1833, the tribute paid by Mohammed Ali, was only 12,000 purses, equivalent to £60,000 sterling. It is now (1861) 60,000 purses, in English money £300,000 a year.

The superficial extent of Egypt is estimated at 8372 square geographical miles, of which a tenth part only is cultivated.

BANK OF EGYPT.

The introduction of banks into Turkey and Egypt has not been productive of the advantages expected from them. A recent report of the directors of the Bank of Egypt, gives an account of pecuniary advances made to an enormous amount to Egyptian grandees, which had "completely paralyzed" the bank for some months previously; for instance, to the state prince, El Hami Pacha, the son of the late viceroy, Abbas Pacha.

The following is an extract from the report of the Bank of Egypt, presented to the annual general meeting of shareholders, on the 25th of February, 1861.

"The directors of the Bank of Egypt submit to the shareholders the accounts for the half-year, ending the 31st of December, 1860. These accounts would have worn a different aspect, if the directors had taken credit for the large amount of interest which has accrued on the debt of the late Prince El Hami Pacho. They entertain no doubt that this debt and the large amount of interest will be eventually paid in full; but, as part only of the amount due has as yet been recovered, all the moneys realized have been placed to the credit of capital. The transactions connected with this loan to the Prince have attracted so much public attention, and have also exercised so large an influence on the affairs of the bank, that the directors deem it necessary to give a brief statement of the facts of the case.

"El Hami Pacha was the son of the late Viceroy, Abbas Pacha. He had a very large income; but being in want of ready money, his agents, Messrs. Oppenheim and Chabert, borrowed from time to time sums amounting in the aggregate to £162,000 from the managers in Egypt. This money was advanced on bills for three months, collaterally secured by assignments of very valuable property. Advances of such mag-

nitude to one person were contrary to the direct instructions of the court, who, in this particular case, added an express prohibition, which was entirely disregarded by all the managers. The Prince being about to leave Egypt for Constantinople before the bills matured, the managers deemed it advisable under the circumstances to prevent his departure. This attempt however failed, on its being proved, by an investigation made (at the instigation of the Viceroy) by the British consul-general and Mr. Hugh Thurburn, that the securities held by the bank were amply sufficient to cover their claim. The bills however were not paid; and owing to the consequent lock-up of the capital of the company, and to the great confusion and scandal which followed, upon the attempt to detain the Prince in Egypt, the business of the bank was brought nearly to a stand-still. The directors,having had much cause to feel dissatisfied with the conduct of the managers, even before this incident, requested the deputy chairman, Mr. Anstruther, to proceed at once to Egypt to inquire into the exact position of this large debt, and the affairs of the bank in general, who went out armed with full powers from the court, and was accompanied by an able English lawyer. The information obtained by the deputy chairman satisfied the court of directors that they were fully justified in their feeling of dissatisfaction. His visit and examination of affairs led to the almost immediate resignation of the local managers . . . and to an entire remodelling of the establishments in Egypt. The directors, as before stated, entertain no doubt that the debt due from the estate of El Hami Pacha will be paid in full: it has already been reduced by various payments to the extent of £70,000 up to the 31st December, and further sums are being received daily. The deputy chairman inquired into other advances injudiciously made, and entirely contrary to repeated instructions. These were all fully investigated, and arrangements were made by him for placing them in a course of speedy settlement. The total amount is about £120,000, and though the directors do not expect that these advances, mainly secured on land taken as collateral security, can be realized without

some loss, they have no doubt that the deficiency will be covered without encroachment on the capital of the bank. The board of management in Egypt has been entirely reorganized.

"From the foregoing statement, the shareholders will readily understand that the business of the bank in Egypt having been completely paralyzed for several months, no considerable profits could be realized."

ARMY.

SINCE 1840 the military force of Egypt was restricted by the terms forced upon Mohammed Ali by the Porte and allied powers, to 15,000 men.

In 1858 the Viceroy had an army of 24,000 men, including a regiment of negroes, of Soudan, of 3000 men; and when I was last in Egypt (1860), I was informed that the effective military force of Egypt was 30,000 men.

NAVY.

THE once formidable fleet of Mohammed Ali has dwindled away to a corvet, and a few small vessels, and a couple of sea-going steamers that are really serviceable. The vessels of the line and frigates that Mohammed Ali left to his degenerate successor, dismantled and utterly neglected, are rotting in the inner port of Alexandria, and of all these vessels of war—not one "lofty prow shall ever stem the billows more." On paper however, the fleet of Said Pacha cuts a respectable figure in the pages of the "Almanack de Gotha," of 1860:—"seven vessels of the line, 6 frigates, 4 corvettes, 7 brigs, 2 steamers (postal), twenty-three transports."

The number of vessels, including steamers, that entered the Port of Alexander in 1858, was 2171, of which number the vessels under the English flag were 278.

The cotton plant was first introduced from India into Egypt, in 1819; and from the name of its introducer, was called Maho Cotton, and was cultivated for some time more experimentally,

than with a view to mercantile results, in the gardens of Moharrem Bey.

The cultivation of cotton for exportation commenced in Egypt in 1821, only four years before my arrival in that country.

In 1822 the number of bales exported amounted to 541.

In 1840 the number of bales exported was 136,000.

If the Gotha Almanack of 1860 is to be believed, the population of Egypt, which in 1847, it is most erroneously stated, was 4,250,000, had increased, in1859, to 5,125,000 inhabitants (*d'apres le recensement de* 1859).

The above estimate is an enormous exaggeration, in fact more than double the real amount of population, and indeed it is in flagrant contradiction with a previous estimate of the population of Egypt, including that of Dongola and Sennaar, in 1844, given in the table of the population of the Turkish provinces in the same "Almanack de Gotha" (*d'apres le* Baron de Reden), where the inhabitants of Egypt, Dongola, and Sennaar, are set down as 3,350,000,

The present population, according to the most authentic accounts I could get at Alexandria in August, 1860, did not exceed two millions, thus distributed :—

Arabs, Fellahs	(Mohammedans)	1,750,000
Turks, officials chiefly	,,	12,000
Copts	(Christians)	150,000
Syrians	,,	6,500
Greeks	,,	8,000
Armenians	,,	3,500
Jews	,,	5,000
Europeans—of whom Italians are the majority		50,000
Negroes of Soudan, Nubians, Berberi, and Moors		15,000
Total . . .		2,000,000

"The population of Egypt (according to Mr. Gardner Wilkinson, in 1847) which 200 years previously was estimated at four millions, then amounted to 1,800,000 souls, having been reduced since 1800 from 2,500,000 to that number. Plague,

and Turkish government have lessened, and still lessen the population of all Egypt, Alexandria alone excepted, which, through increasing commerce, contains nearly ten times the number of inhabitants it did before the time of Mohammed Ali. The revenue of Egypt is said to be about £3,500,000 sterling."

On my first visit to Egypt, in 1825, the population of that country was estimated at 2,000,000

On my second visit, in 1840, it was estimated at rather less than 2,000,000

And on my third visit, in 1860, it was estimated at somewhat exceeding 2,000,000

The population of Alexandria, in 1825, the date of my first visit, was 16,000*

Of this number, the Arabs, constituted about 9,000; the Turks 2,500; the Greeks, 2,000; the Jews, 500; the Franks of all nations, 2,000.

When I visited Alexandria, in 1840, the population had increased to . . . . . 60,000†

And if the sailors and marines of the two fleets then in port, and the troops recently brought down from the Hedjaz, were taken into account, the total numbers would be little short of 70,000.

Seven years later, Sir Gardner Wilkinson estimated the population of Alexandria, including the garrison, and sailors of the fleet (amounting to about 20,000), at 80,000

When I visited Alexandria, in 1860, the result of all my inquiries led me to estimate the population of Alexandria, including garrison (sailors of the fleet being nil.), at 180,000

Now the Almanack of Gotha for 1860, estimates the population of Alexandria at 400,000

An enormous exaggeration which is surprising to meet in a periodical generally so remarkable for its statistics.

* Madden's Travels in Turkey, Egypt, and Palestine, in 1824, 1825, 1826, and 1827. Lon. 8vo. 1829, vol. i. p. 206.

† Madden's "Egypt and Mohammed Ali." Lon. 8vo. 1841, p. 39.

When I first visited Cairo, in 1825, the population was estimated at 220,000
On my second in 1840, the population was reduced to 210,000
On my last visit visit, in 1860, it was reduced to . 200,000
I find the population of Cairo estimated, in 1847, by Sir Gardner Wilkinson (Handbook in Egypt), at 200,000*

Thus composed:—Moslems, 121,000; Copts, 60,000; Jews, 4,000; Franks and Greeks, 8,500; Armenians, 2,000; Roman Catholics of all races, 4,500.

English influence has fallen in Egypt exceedingly low, since my first acquaintance with that country, when Mr. Salt was Consul-General of Egypt. When that gentleman, who was a scholar, an artist, an able enlightened man, was appointed to his office, the theory fortunately had not been adopted by the British Government, that "Consular dignity" could only be supported in the East by some antiquated colonel or a protegé of the Evangelical Alliance, in the odour of sanctity, with some Missionary Society.

Since 1840 especially, English decline has been most remarkable. I think Eliot Warburton was greatly mistaken in the opinion he entertained that England was "expected," by Egyptians, or desired by them.

Eliot Warburton observes, "There is an evident expectation in the public mind of Cairo, that England must sooner or later take a leading part in Egyptian politics. . . . So it is however, as every traveller will bear witness. England is expected in the land, where hitherto she has never planted a standard, except in defence of the Crescent, and the integrity of the Turkish dominions. That she will ever come forward to vindicate the Cross, where her best and bravest blood was shed in its defence, 600 years ago, is very problematical; however, 'Gold wins its way where angels might despair,' and the inte-

* Sir G. Wilkinson says the population of Cairo, at the commencement of this century was 300,000, and is now reduced to 200,000.

rests of India may obtain, what the sepulchre of Christ has been denied."*

Poor Warburton ventured no farther—"This," he adds, "is a delicate subject, so we will waive it."

One of the best of modern travellers in the East, Lieutenant Burton [vol. i. p. 162], speaking of the feeling that existed in Egypt, at the period of the first rumours of a Russian war, with respect to the Franks of the several *infidel* nations of Europe, says, "All seemed delighted at the idea of French co-operation (with Turkey), for somehow or other the Frenchman is everywhere popular. When speaking of England they were not equally easy; heads were rolled, pious sentences were ejaculated, and finally out came the old Eastern cry,—'Of a truth they are *Shaitans*' (Anglice, 'devils.') . . . Hating and despising Europeans, they still long for European rule. This people admire an iron-handed, and iron-hearted despotism; they hate a timid and a grinding tyranny. Of all foreigners, they would prefer the French yoke. A circumstance which I would attribute to the diplomatic and national dignity of our neighbours across the channel."†

* "The Crescent and the Cross," vol. i. p. 385.

† Burton's "Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina." Lon. 8vo. 1855, vol. i. p. 163.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Sultan Mahmoud II. and his Reforms.—The Janissary Institution Reformed Altogether.—Death of the Sultan.

SULTAN MAHMOUD had no sooner been seated on the throne than Bairactar was appointed grand vizier. The latter, at the beginning of his ministerial career, acted with great energy and vigour in the prosecution of Selim's projects against the Janissaries, and the creation of a new military force on the European system. Moussa Pacha, and all the other functionaries who had taken a part in the murder of Selim, were put to death.

The Janissaries and Ulemas, while the Bosnian and Albanian troops of Bairactar were in the immediate vicinity of Constantinople, deemed it prudent to appear not only submissive, in regard to the new measures of military reform, but even acquiescent in them. Bairactar, imposed on by these false appearances, issued a fatal order for the return of the provincial troops to the frontiers, having only 4,000 men, disciplined on the European system to rely on in the capital.

His friend, Cadi Pacha, commanded a body of 8,000 Asiatic troops, who were encamped at Scutari. Two nights had not passed over after the departure of the provincial troops, when the Janissaries in great force, surrounded the palace of the Porte, in which the grand vizier, Bairactar resided, and having, as usual, overturned their camp kettle, set fire to that part of

the palace in which their enemy, the grand vizier, was domiciled. Bairactar escaped into a tower which was used as a powder magazine, and there defended himself valiantly against the assaults of a furious multitude of Janissaries, and only ceased his desperate efforts when he and the tower were blown into the air. The Janissaries now assailed the new troops in still greater force, and would have annihilated them had not Cadi Pacha, with his 8,000 Asiatics, come to their aid from Scutari.

The battle between those troops and the Janissaries, lasted for two days, in the streets of Constantinople without any decisive result. The Captain Pacha, Said Ali, co-operated with Cadi Pacha, bringing a ship of the line to that part of the harbour commanding the barracks of the Janissaries, and pouring in repeated broadsides. Several portions of the town in that direction were set on fire.

The conflagration and the street fighting continued to the 17th of March, when the old allies of the Janissaries, the Topdschi, or artillery men, and the Galiongees who, up to that time had remained quiescent, joined the Janissaries in considerable numbers, and gave the victory to the latter.

While the fighting was going on, Sultan Mahmoud kept the gates of the Imperial palace closed. The deposed Sultan, his brother Mustapha, was an inmate of it, closely watched and guarded of course, for the insurrection then reigning had been made with the view of restoring Mustapha to the throne. Had he been left alive, Mahmoud must have expected the fate which Selim met with by the orders of Mustapha, and which had been designed for himself, on the old policy of securing life by remaining the sole scion of the house of Othman. Accordingly, while the civil war was raging in the streets, the deposed Mustapha was put to death in his apartments.

Recent historians, who eulogize, and not unjustly, the subsequent reforming career of Mahmoud, think it necessary to involve his brother's death in obscurity, and to leave the matter one of uncertainty, as to who the person was who gave the order

for Mustapha's execution. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, but that Mahmoud sacrificed his brother's life to save his own. Certainly there is no more doubt on that subject, than that Mustapha had procured the death of Sultan Selim, and had ordered the death of his brother Mahmoud. The victorious Janissaries, having got rid of the obnoxious grand vizier, and finding it necessary to allow Sultan Mahmoud to reign, made what terms they pleased with the latter.

Imperial edicts were wrung from the Sultan, re-establishing the old military tyranny in all its former force and terror, and solemnly abjuring and proscribing the new military system, and all the other innovations of the Giaours. From that time (the 17th of March, 1809), to the period of the last overturning of the camp kettles in the Etmidan (the 15th of June, 1826), for a period of more than seventeen years, when Sultan Mahmoud was fully prepared to deal with the old oppressors of his race, one master-thought, day after day, and year after year, seems to have had possession of the mind of Mahmoud, and to have been brooded over in silence, and with unceasing vigilance —the destruction of the Janissaries.

The number of Sultans deposed and put to death by the Janissaries, or by their means, is considerable.

They deposed Bajazet II. in 1512; they caused the death of Amurath III. in 1595; they occasioned the downfall of Osman II., and subsequently his death, in 1622; they deposed Mustapha I. in the same year; they deposed Ibrahim, and subsequently strangled him, in 1649; they were mainly instrumental in the deposition of Mahomet IV., in 1687 (idem of Mustapha II., in 1703); they deposed and imprisoned Achmet III., having previously caused the deaths of his Grand Vizier, Reis Effendi and Capitan Pacha, in 1730; they deposed Selim III., and subsequently occasioned his death, in 1807; they rebelled against Mahmoud II., and occasioned the murder of Mustapha IV., in 1808.

The descriptions given of the personal appearance of Othman, the founder of the Turkish Empire, have often struck me as

having a striking correspondence with that of Sultan Mahmoud II., the father of the present Sultan.

Othman is represented as a grave, pensive-looking, dignified personage; of stature, tall and portly; of a majestic, solemn, noble aspect and deportment; of a graceful form and upright carriage, befitting a prince—neither too spare nor too stout, but robust and vigorous. His face was long and sombre—pale, but manly in its expression; his features large, finely formed; his arched eyebrows, and his long beard of that jet black color, which had obtained for him the addition of Kara to his name—the Black Othman.

This portraiture of Othman would have served for that of a descendant and successor of his (separated from his times by an interval of five centuries), whom I have seen on several occasions, but very distinctly and particularly on one occasion (in November, 1824), at a Djereed tournament, in the vicinity of Constantinople, of which I have given an account in my "Travels in Turkey, Egypt, Nubia, and Palestine;" in 1824, 1825, 1826 and 1827.* This last remnant of Saracenic chivalry—the Djereed mock combat and festive pageant, was in honour of the birth of an imperial child, which had been announced by a salvo of artillery from the Seraglio some days previously. The gorgeous spectacle has made an impression on my mind which, even now, at the distance of thirty-six years, remains indelible. And, indeed, if I were to name the most imposing spectacle I ever beheld, I should say it was that of the Djereed spectacle above referred to, with its immense assemblage of human beings, estimated at 60,000 persons of either sex, in all the varieties of oriental costume, and beautiful contrasts of diversified colors, seated on the sloping sides of a natural amphitheatre. In front of the valley, and of that part of it by which the mounted cavaliers, flourishing their Djereeds (pointless slender lances, from five to six feet long), came galloping into the arena, on an eminence,

* London, 1829. 8vo. Vol. i., p. 96.

surrounded by his court and great functionaries of state, in gorgeous robes, sat the Sultan, magnificently apparelled, and immediately encircled by the slaves of the Seraglio, black and white, in rich attire, gaudy array, and with abundance of glittering arms. The Sultan Mahmoud appeared to me then to be about forty-four years of age—his figure majestic, and his aspect noble. His long black beard added to the solemnity of his features, which he never relaxed for a moment, while laughter was excited all around him by the buffoonery of a professional jester, who amused the multitude in the intervals between the onsets in the tournament. The dark eye of Mahmoud, indeed, followed all the antics of the buffoon, *but he never smiled during the performance.* Other performers were in the presence of the Sultan on that remarkable occasion, besides the mock combatants and the merry-andrews, for the amusement of the multitude. The Janissaries were there in great numbers, in the presence of their sovereign, in all their barbarous state pomp and festival equipment—ridiculously accoutered, most uncouthly clad and ornamented. Their unsightly and unshapely head-gear was adorned with feathers ludicrously stuck behind; their loins were swathed to an enormous and most ungraceful size with shawls and twisted muslin rollers, and all the cumbrous bandaging in front was stuck with pistols of inordinate size, and a *hanjar*, of formidable dimensions, clumsily projecting from the pit of the stomach.

I do not think it was possible for humanity, in any state of barbarism or savagery, to render its appearance more brutish and disgusting than the Janissaries rendered theirs.

I must call the reader's attention to the date of this pageant and tournament, in which the Janissaries represented and displayed the martial pomp and circumstance of their Institution—November, 1824. Within a year and a half of that date the tragedy was performed in the great square of the Atmeidan, in Stamboul, by the orders of Sultan Mahmoud—the *dénouement* of which was the massacre of the Janissaries.

That the ruin of their Institution had been long previously contemplated by the Sultan, I know was the opinion of Mr. Turner, the British Minister of the Porte, at the period of my residence in Constantinople, and down to the end of 1824.

If the destruction of this formidable body of troops had been partial, or amounted to a few hundreds only, as some writers assert, their complete subjugation could not have been effected, however disastrous to its organisation a defeat like that which it sustained, on the occasion above referred to, might have been for the time being, or even for a considerable period. The military monster of the Turkish Empire would have been only "scotched, not killed."

It is impossible to ascertain what the actual numbers of the effective Janissary force in Constantinople were at the time of the massacre. They have been estimated at fifty thousand, forty thousand, and even at so low an amount as ten thousand. All my inquiries lead me to conclude they were not under twenty-five thousand.

Baron de Tott considered the number of Janissaries who really existed amounted to 400,000. Monsieur Peyssonel states that the number of enrolled Janissaries amounted to millions! But the actual number of men belonging to this force did not exceed 40,000, who received pay from the Treasury—pay being only received by the Janissaries of the *Odas*, or barracks of Constantinople, and those distributed in fortresses, who, in Janissary parlance, "followed their kettle" in garrisons.

The great mass who were not on service, and who received no pay—but, being enrolled, were exempted from taxes and certain duties to the state—were called *yamahs*.

In the time of Mohammed II. (the captor of Constantinople at the age of three-and-twenty), Professor Creasy informs us "the Ottoman Empire contained in Europe above thirty-six sandjaks, or banners, round each of which assembled about four hundred cavaliers. The entire military horse and foot of the empire in both continents was more than 100,000, without reckoning the irregular bands of the Akindji and

Azabs. The ordinary revenues of the state at that time amounted to more than two million ducats.

"The Janissaries were still the main strength of the Turkish armies; and though Mohammed the 2nd increased their number, he never had more than 12,000 under arms." *

Strange and wonderful it is, indeed, that with so small a force as we read of in the preceding passage, exploits of such gigantic dimensions should have been accomplished by Mohammed II. This captor of Constantinople, and destroyer of the Greek Empire, the conqueror of two empires—those of Byzantium and Trebizond—of four kingdoms, twenty provinces, and two hundred towns and cities. The Turkish devastator, happily for Christendom, passed away in 1481. Eleven years after his death, it would seem as if Providence was pleased to redress the wrongs of the Old World in a new and hitherto unknown region. In 1492, the future Discoverer of that New World set out on his first voyage across the Atlantic.

"The pay and the privileges of the Janissaries (we are told by Professor Creasy) were largely augmented by the conqueror of Constantinople; and, as the Turkish power was extended in Europe, care was taken to recruit that chosen corps from children who were natives of the continent, rather than among the Asiatics. The levies for that purpose were generally made in Albania, Bosnia, and Bulgaria. It is said that there was seldom need to employ force in collecting the requisite number of suitable children, and that the parents were eager to obtain the enrolment of their boys in the list of Janissary recruits. This, if true, is rather a proof of the moral depravity of the Christian population which the Ottomans subdued, than of any mildness of the Ottomans in enforcing the institution of Khalil Tchendereli. It is also stated that no compulsion was used to induce the young recruits to leave the Christian and adopt the Mohammedan faith; but this was a mere pretext of forbearance—as, from the early age at which the children were

* Creasy's "History of Ottoman Turks." Vol. i., p. 160.

selected, it would be absurd to suppose that they were free agents in following the new religious rites, and repeating the new prayers, which were taught them as soon as they entered the training schools of the Janissaries. It is certain that the compulsory enrolment and conversion of youths taken in war was often practised; as in the instance of the young Genoese nobles, who became the captives of Mohammed at the conquest of Kaffa."* The sophistry of the Christian apologists of Turkish institutions in general, and of this mode of recruiting the Turkish army in particular, I have elsewhere dealt with and disposed of.

On the 15th of June, 1826, the long meditated massacre of the Janissaries was at length carried into execution by Sultan Mahmoud II., who had been studying accounts of street engagements with insurgent forces for some time, and had made himself acquainted with the mode in which Murat, in 1808, had cleared the streets of Madrid with cannon. From that time he devoted particular attention to his artillery, and officered it with men on whom he could entirely rely. He had 14,000 artillery-men in and near Constantinople, the morning of the day on which he determined the Janissaries should perish.

The general of the artillery force was a man wholly devoted to the Sultan, named Ibrahim, who, from his dark complexion, fierce and terrible expression of countenance, was known in Stamboul as "Kara Djehennem," or "Black Hell." Everything was duly prepared, with horrible forethought, to lure this great mass of insolent, besotted, brutalised men, step by step to their destruction, till, once more intent on a revolt, they rushed wildly from their barracks to the great square of the Atmeidan, and overturned their soup kettles for the last time, the well-known signal of insurrection.

A modern historian of the events and times of the Sultan Mahmoud says:—

"In a solemn meeting of the grandees of the empire, on the

* Creasy's "History of Ottoman Turks." Vol. i., p. 162.

22nd of May, 1826, the grand vizier explained the reasons for the measure; on the 28th of May, the imperial decree appeared to re-organise the Janissaries; it concluded with these words, 'Vengeance! people of Mohammed, vengeance! faithful servants of this empire, which shall endure as long as the world, vengeance! officers of all ranks, defenders of our faith, come to us; we will through our united endeavours, repair our breaches and *raise up the walls* of an invincible army before our country, in opposition to the whole world; we will frustrate the stratagems of Christian Europe!'

"According to the enactments of this decree, young men were to be taken from the Janissary body, and under the name of active soldiers, to be divided into regiments, and instructed in the strategy of Christendom. These instructions were carried out. In the night of the 15th of June, 1826, a fearful insurrection of the Janissaries took place; more than 30,000 revolted against the government. Mahmoud, at the head of an already prepared, and faithful army of 50,000 men, destroyed the entire body of the Janissaries, of whom at least 20,000 fell. Another imperial decree was also issued at the same time against the Dervishes."

When Sultan Mahmoud judged the time was come for the execution of his long-projected massacre of the Janissaries, he had before him the encouraging example of the destruction of Strelitzes, the Janissaries of Russia, by Peter the Great, and the carnage of the Mamelukes of Egypt, by Mohammed Ali Pacha. But Mahmoud's project was a more difficult and dangerous undertaking than either of the preceding.

The Janissaries, were numerous, powerful, and influential; they had all the functionaries of the religion of the State on their side with one exception. The Mufti had been gained over by the Sultan to the project. The military commanders of the different corps that composed the garrison of the capital had been specially appointed some time previously, for the reliance he could place on their devotion. He largely augmented the artillery force of the capital, for he had read that it was with

cannon that troops could be best mowed down in confined spaces.

He had previously diminished the strength of the Janissaries for several years during the Greek insurrection, by constantly sending detachments to the seat of war to places where they were unsupported by other troops, and from which they returned not.

Marshal Marmont estimated the number of Janissaries slain in the square of the Atmeidan, and in their barracks, at 500; Professor Creasy at 4,000; some writers at 6,000, others at 20,000. Marmont's absurd estimate is probably the farthest from the truth of all these data.

The total number of dead bodies found in the square of the Atmeidan, and in the barracks of the Janissaries, partially demolished by artillery, during the massacre of the 15th of June, 1826, I believe may be estimated at 6,000. The number of the wounded, who survived that day's slaughter, but died of their wounds, may be estimated at 4,000. The number of the Janissaries put to death in the principal towns and fortresses, and in the provinces, may be estimated at as many more; and the total number destroyed in this great onslaught on the proscribed force, may be set down as exceeding 20,000.

On the 27th of October, 1827, the combined squadrons of England, Russia, and Turkey, entered the Bay of Navarino, and an engagement with the Turco-Egyptian fleet was the result, which lasted for four hours, and ended in the total destruction of the Sultan's magnificent armament. This "untoward event" for the Sultan, was a most auspicious one for Greece. The independence of Greece was virtually decided by it, and the irreparable loss to Turkey of one of the most valuable of all her provinces, a loss which she never recovered, and never will recover from.

Russia allowed a very brief breathing time to Turkey; she left nothing undone to provoke a new quarrel, and was successful, and on the 20th of December, 1827, Turkey declared war against Russia.

The *coup de grace* given to the naval force of Turkey at Navarino, was followed up, almost superfluously, by a Russian invasion of the Danubian provinces in the following year, by the occupation of Greece by 20,000 French troops, and the expulsion of the Turks out of the Morea. The Russo-Turkish war of 1828 and 1829, was the crowning calamity of the many disasters that had fallen in such rapid succession on the Ottoman Empire.

In May, 1828, the Russians crossed the Pruth, Sultan Mahmoud being unable to make any vigorous defence, either of the Danubian provinces or of the fortresses on the Danube. All efforts of resistance were limited to the prevention, if possible, of the Russians passing over the Balkan. The Turkish commander, Hussein Pacha, judged it prudent to avoid any engagement till the Russians had encamped before Shumla, in the latter part of July. The fortified camp of the Turks at that place was blockaded by the Russians, and their communication with Adrianople cut off. The two armies remained, in fact, in a state of inactivity for nearly a month. At length, Hussein Pacha thought it was decreed by inexorable fate that he should fight. So, on the night of the 25th and 26th of August, he moved three divisions of the Turkish army in perfect stillness, with the view of falling unexpectedly on the unwary Russians. The latter, however, were on the watch, and in readiness to receive their enemies. An obstinate and bloody engagement along the whole line of the Russians ensued, which terminated in compelling the Russian General, Rudiger, to retire from Eski Stamboul, and the Turks to re-open the communication with Adrianople. The Russians remained in position before Shumla, chiefly with a view to the siege of Varna, which was then proceeding under Prince Mentschikoff. All the outposts which the Turks had established round Varna had been taken by the Russians, and several engagements had taken place before the besieged city, in all of which the Turks were defeated. In October, Varna capitulated to the Russians. The main body of the Russian

army before Shumla wintered in the Danubian provinces. In Asia the Russo-Turkish campaign terminated disastrously for the Ottoman Empire. The great Turkish fortress of Kars was taken by the Russians in July, 1828. The Turkish force under Mahmoud Pacha, near Akhaltsheh, was ignominiously routed and dispersed; and all the fortresses on the line of route to Erzeroum were taken by the Russians. The severity of winter put an end for some months to the war.

The new campaign of 1829 opened with a new train of disasters to the Turks. In July, Erzeroum surrendered without resistance to the Russians. In October, General Paskewitsch defeated 10,000 Turks, under Osman Pacha, at Baiburt; and the Seraskier Oglan Pacha retreated precipitately with his whole army.

In European Turkey things went on less disgracefully, but not much more prosperously, for Turkish arms. In June, Marshall Diebitch crossed the Balkan, effecting the passage without much difficulty, or any resistance. In the same month, the fortress of Ibrail was taken by the Russians; but they had worse enemies in their camp than Turkish foes—they had plague and dysentery, and lost many thousands of men by these pestilences.

The newly-appointed Grand Vizier, Redschid Pacha (not the Minister of that name), in the months of May and June, showed more energy and capacity than any of the Sultan's commanders in the previous or present campaign. He attacked the Russians on two occasions successfully, but the disorganization of his troops, sudden panics, irreparable mistakes of subordinate officers, led to defeats, retreats, and great losses. In June, the Russians gained a complete victory at Kulutscha. The Grand Vizier and his army were cut off from Schumla; and a little later, in another engagement, during a sudden panic, the whole Turkish force fled in the utmost disorder, before an attacking force of some battalions of General Diebitch. On the 30th of June, the important Turkish garrison of Silistria capitulated.

The former Grand Vizier's army, before Shumla, sustained, not only several defeats, but the signal discomfiture of nearly all his plans and strategetic projects. In August, he abandoned his position at Shumla, and advanced with the 12,000 men remaining under his command towards Adrianople, and was attacked by Diebitch, with a force of 22,000, and put to flight.

Diebitch then advanced against Adrianople, the second city of the Turkish Empire, with only 30,000 men, and besieged it. The commander of the garrison, Kalil Pacha, offered to capitulate, and only stipulated for a free passage for himself and his troops. These terms were refused by the Russian General; and fourteen hours only were given the Turkish commander to surrender, on the conditions proposed by Diebitch, or to take the consequences of refusal. Within the prescribed time of fourteen hours, the Sultan Mahmoud had to abate his pride—finding there was nothing left for him, or for his Empire, but peace at any price. Peace was accordingly determined on, and signed at Adrianople on the 14th of September, 1829.

The Ottoman Porte surrendered to Russia—in Asia, the fortresses taken by them on the eastern coast of the Black Sea, with the fortresses also of Akhaltstheh, and some territory connected with them. In Europe, as formerly, the Pruth and the Danube were to form the boundaries. The islands at the mouth of the Danube, in the possession of the Turks, were to be surrendered to the Russians. With respect to the two Danubian Principalities, a special agreement was entered into; the principal stipulations being—that the hospodar should be chosen for life, instead of for seven years, as formerly; should have the management of public affairs, with the approbation of the Divan; the right to use arms to maintain order; finally, that no Mohammedan in future should reside in the Danubian Principalities, and that all fortresses on the left bank of the Danube should be destroyed. Moreover, the peace of Adrianople secured to Russian subjects freedom of trade throughout the Turkish dominions, and guaranteed that, during their

residence in Turkey, they should not be under Turkish jurisdiction, but under their own ambassador or consul. The indemnification for the war on Russia was stipulated, in a secret article, at ten millions of ducats, a sum which, however, was diminished to seven. The Porte also gave its consent to the agreement on the 6th of July, 1827, and to all later arrangements upon which Russia, France, and England had agreed respecting the situation of liberated Greece.

In fact, the two campaigns of 1828 and 1829 decided the fate of the Ottoman Empire. It was made apparent to the world that Turkish military power was utterly incapable of encountering and resisting Russian armies with any prospect of success.

By the treaty of Adrianople, the Ottoman Empire suffered more in power and prestige, in territorial rights and advantages, and in material interests, than she had ever done before, since the Turkish Empire was founded by Emir Othman. From 1832, Mahmoud had to combat against the son of the vice-king of Egypt, Mohammed Ali, who aimed at entire independence, till, in the year 1833, the war then waged was ended by a treaty. It was on this occasion that a Russian army occupied and protected Constantinople—a blow more fatal than its conquest would have been. The Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, concluded on this occasion, converted Turkey almost into a vassal of Russia.

This was the time, and these were the circumstances under which Sultan Mahmoud undertook to reform the institutions of his Empire. Most of his administrative efforts in this direction were subsequent to the Treaty of Adrianople. Many of these reforms were at variance with his religion—were violations of the law of Islam.

In the year 1834, he was again implicated in a serious war with Mohammed Ali, Pacha of Egypt. Mahmoud did not survive this struggle; he died on the 1st of July, 1839. The old rebel Pacha of Egypt outlived him ten years.

Of the many attempts of the Sultan Mahmoud to enlighten

his subjects, the introduction of the printing press was particularly objectionable to the Ulemas. Always faithful to the interests of their sacred corps, these vigilant custodians of the faith saw great mischief to religion in printed books, or, rather, prejudice likely to accrue to their sacred calling and character, from this invention of the devil—suggested as it had been to the followers of Mohammed by Christian dogs and unbelievers. So early as 1727, in the reign of Sultan Achmet III., there was a Turkish printing press in operation in Constantinople. The Ulemas, however, denounced its use, as being profane and impious. The Koran was not allowed to be printed, and in the course of a hundred years very few books issued from the Turkish press. The piety of the Ulemas was so far successful.

An attempt was made, in 1795, by a French Ambassador to Sultan Selim III. to circulate a gazette in Constantinople, printed at the place of the French Embassy, at Pera; but the "Gazette" died out shortly after its first appearance. In 1811, during the Russian war, extracts from the bulletins of the Grand Army were printed at the French Embassy, and circulated extensively in Constantinople.

Newspapers in the Turkish language, and also in Greek, Armenian, French, and Italian, have been set up in Constantinople and Smyrna, at several periods since 1825. The first of these newspapers, "Spectateur de l'Orient," was set up in Smyrna by a Frenchman, M. Alexandre Blacque, in 1825. This paper, soon after its origin, assumed the name of "Courier de Smyrne," and, up to 1828, exercised an important influence on the circumstances attending the termination of the Greek Revolution. The particular mission of this journal was abuse of the Hellenic government and Capo d'Istrias, and it is said to have largely contributed to the downfall of the latter. In 1831, the generous Frenchman was summoned to Stamboul, by the grateful Sultan Mahmoud, to establish in that city the "Moniteur Ottomani," the official journal of the Porte, published in the French language.

In 1829, another official journal was set up in Stamboul, by the Sultan's orders, of the nature of an Imperial Gazette, in Turkish—a reproduction of all the ordinances and acts of the government, which appeared in the "Moniteur Ottomani." This paper was called the "Takvini Vakai," or "Table of Events." In 1836, M. A. Blacque died suddenly, at Malta, on his way to France, on a confidential mission from the Sultan; and it was considered a singular coincidence, that the two editors who, after M. Blacque's sudden death, were entrusted with the management of the papers, came to a sudden end within the short period of two years.

The "Moniteur Ottomani," like its editors, came to a sudden death also, after a short struggle with adverse influences, exercised by the representatives of two *friendly* powers!

A new Turkish paper, named "Djeredi Kavadisi," "Register of News," succeeded the defunct "Moniteur." The "Smyrna Courier" was succeeded by another French paper—"Journal de Smyrne." In a short time Smyrna boasted of five newspapers—two published in Greek, one in Armenian, and one in Hebrew.

In 1853, there were four French newspapers, four Italian, one Greek, one Armenian, one Bulgarian, one Turkish state gazette, and one English paper. Six of these papers received an annual stipend from the state.

Sultan Mahmoud made a vain effort to appease the offended fanaticism of the Mufti and Ulemas of Stamboul. In January, 1837, he issued an ordinance, and had it promulgated in all the thoroughfares of the capital and principal towns throughout Turkey, commanding all true believers to perform their devotions in the mosques. So long as the Imperial edict was enforced by the bastinado, duly administered by the *Cavasses*, the faithful once more frequented the mosques; but when the Cavasses left off bastinading tepid, or torpid, believers in the law of Islam, the latter left off going to their prayers.

The Imperial edict was still in force in 1838, when Bishop

Southgate was in Constantinople. The fact is, the faith of the Mohammedans had been shaken by the reforming principles and proceedings of Sultan Mahmoud and his successor. But nothing has been substituted for it, and, strange to say, all the old fanaticism of the Turks remains, not only undiminished, but rendered more fierce and formidable than ever by exasperation.

M'Farlane makes a judicious remark on this subject. "Were there some other belief taking the place of the old one, were there other religious observances substituted for those of the Koran, this decay of Islam might be a matter of congratulation; but, as far as I could discover, Mohammedanism was only giving way to a thorough and heartless infidelity." *

It was only when the Janissaries were disposed of, that Sultan Mahmoud found himself in a position to venture on those reforms on which he had long meditated. The first great attempt to reform the Institutions of the Turkish Empire was made by Sultan Selim, and that attempt was fatal to him. The second attempt of a *bonâ fide* character, and of a more comprehensive kind, was planned, and partly carried into effect, by the late Sultan Mahmoud, about thirty-five years ago. In 1824, when I was in Constantinople, the Janissaries were at the height of their power and pre-eminence—a ferocious, fanatic soldiery, without limits to their prerogatives, or restraint on their insolence and turbulence—alike formidable to the Sultan, his government, and his Christian subjects. Mahmoud had the opinion strongly impressed on his mind, that the condition of the Ottoman Empire, moral and physical, social and political, was so unsound, so bad in all its parts, head, and members, that any remedy for its renovation must be of a kind suited to the gravity of this disorder. The first measure concocted by him was the destruction of the Janissaries, and this wholesale carnage—for such it was—of the picked

* "Turkey and its Destinies." Vol. ii., p. 572.

force to whom the protection of the Empire, and the capital especially, had been for centuries confided, was effected by the new troops, previously organised on European principles of discipline and tactics, and stationed in barracks in the suburbs and adjacent towns of Constantinople.

The first sanguinary proceeding in the path of Reform was abundantly successful, so far as the destruction of the Janissaries was concerned. But, at that first step, the progress of Reform met with serious impediments. The ferocious and fanatical defenders of Mohammedanism were swept away by the sword of the reforming Sultan, but the priests of that fanaticism remained unscathed. The Muftis and Ulemas continued in the enjoyment of their old consideration and distinction, in possession of vast treasure and emolument, derived from bequests left to them for charitable and religious purposes. The bold reforming Sultan, who felt no qualms of conscience when he issued the order for the massacre of fifteen or twenty thousand ferocious Janissaries, quailed before the passive resistance of a college of Ulemas, and a corps of priests and doctors of the law of Islam.

The Sultan Mahmoud lived long enough to find that he had commenced building-up Reform on a bad foundation—on sand; that, instead of being cemented by blood, it had become more unstable by its admixture. When he was dying, he is said to have expressed, in the following mournful and solemn terms, the disappointment he felt at the frustration of his hopes for the regeneration of his country: "When the herbs of the field," said Sultan Mahmoud, "revealed their medicinal properties to the wise Lockman, not one of them said to him—'There is power in me to cure.'"

Sultan Mahmoud's troubled reign of thirty-one years was never free from war, civil or foreign, from the fact or fear of it, from revolt of some pacha or other, or rebellion of rajayhs—Greek, or Wallachian, or Moldavian, or Bosnian—in one province or another, for a single year. And sometimes these

calamities came not singly but *en masse*, and it seemed as if no human energies were capable of coping with such enormous difficulties as Sultan Mahmoud was involved in.

With all the reforming zeal of Sultan Mahmoud, some of the most murderous atrocities of the *regime* of Turkish government remained untouched. "All the male children of the *Sultanas* were destroyed." * The male offspring of the Sultan's slaves were more fortunate. An heir apparent and an heir presumptive of the male sex, have been generally considered the proper compliment of boys to be allowed to live.

An eminent German physician, Dr. Oppenheim, who had been employed professionally by Sultan Mahmoud, as an army surgeon, and had served in a campaign against Russia prior to the last war, published a work in 1833, wherein he makes mention of rumoured practises of Sultan Mahmoud, not on the life but on the reason, of his eldest son, the late Sultan Abdul Medjid. "Although insane persons are so rare, naturals and idiots are not so unfrequent; and occasionally idiotcy is produced in children artificially, by means of giving the child small doses of narcotics from its very infancy; a practice which, by stupefying the sensorium, prevents the mental developement, and ends by producing a state of fatuity." This is an extremely curious statement, and I believe that Dr. Oppenheim is the first who has given us authentic information on this subject. This practice of rendering persons idiotic, is the source of great emolument it is stated; and Dr. Oppenheim says that it is carried into effect, not merely upon children, but upon adults when it is judged necessary to render them incapable of conducting their affairs, while at the same time their removal by death appears for certain reasons impolitic and inexpedient.

"The present Sultan is said to have had recourse to this infamous mode of proceeding in the case of his son and heir-apparent to the throne, Abdul Medjid, a boy nearly thirteen years old. He committed this act lest the Janissaries and their

* *See* White's "Three years in Constantinople." Pub. in 1844 Vol. iii. p. 19.

friends might seize an opportunity of dethroning himself, and of elevating his son in his stead; a fear which led him at a former period to sacrifice his eldest son, then a boy of tender age."*

Sultan Mahmoud, in his latter days, it is said, was addicted to intemperate habits, and carried them to the extent of impairing his understanding, and hastening his death by them. In his last illness he laboured under great dejection of spirits, bordering on insanity.

If Sultan Mahmoud had been a man of a high order of intelligence, he would have perceived the *inutility* of his massacre, and the certainty of having to encounter the fanaticism of the Janissaries, represented in deadly hostility, arrayed in opposition to his projects in the medresschs and the mosques, defended astutely, continuously, and successfully, by a corps of judicial priests and theological doctors.

The fact is, Reform was an impossibility in an empire whose institutions were constituted like those of Turkey. An empire founded on fanaticism by a religious enthusiast, proclaiming as the most religious of all duties, war to the death against all opponents, and denouncing alike Jews and Christians, as enemies in common of the law of Islam, can only be regarded as a system, set up by the power of the sword, and destined to fall sooner or later, whenever the sword of conquest and ascendancy ceased to avail for its protection; or when the original principle of fanaticism that was its vital element, ceased to exist, and the grand tenet of the faith of the Mohammedans, namely, that no religion was to be tolerated, but the one promulgated by Mohammed, was given up.

The tomb of Sultan Mahmoud is described by Commander Lynch, of the American navy, as a sarcophagus about eight feet high, and as many long, covered with purple cloth, embroidered

* "An Account of the State of Medicine in European and Asiatic Turkey, together with Remarks on the most prevalent Diseases, &c." By Freidrich Wilhelm Oppenheim, M.D., Hamburgh, 1832, 8vo. See notice of by Dr. Graves, in the *Dublin Journal of Medical and Chemical Science*, 1834, vol. iv. p. 127.

in gold, and many votive shawls of the richest cashmere thrown over it. . . . At the head is a crimson tarbouch, which the monarch wore in life, with a lofty plume, secured by a large and lustrous aigrette of diamonds. The following words were inscribed in letters of gold on the face of the tomb :—"This is the tomb of the layer of the basis of the civilization of his empire; of the monarch of exalted place, the Sultan victorious and just, Mahmoud Khan, son of the victorious Abd' al Hamid Khan. May the Almighty make his abode in the gardens of Paradise."

CHAPTER XIX.

Sultan Abdul Medjid—His Reforms and their Results.
1839—1861

When Sultan Mahmoud took his departure from this world, the 2nd of July, 1839, at the age of fifty-four, he left his empire in a far worse state than he found it. Von Hammer, in his great work on the History of the Turkish empire, divides that history into seven periods, which he deals with as memorable epochs, marking great changes in the career of the Ottoman Empire; at one era manifesting a good condition of affairs, at another period a worse state of things. The following is a summary of this tabular view of Turkish History:

1.—The first epoch, one of rapid growth from the foundation of the Empire, by Othman, to the capture of Constantinople, in A.D. 1453, and the consolidation of European and Asiatic conquests, of 150 years.

2.—The second, one of territorial aggrandisement, and of wars and conquests on a greater scale than at any former time, down to the accession of Solyman the First, in A.D. 1520, of 67 years.

3.—The third, that of the meridian of its ascendancy, under Solyman the First and Selim the Second, to A.D. 1574, of 54 years.

4.—The fourth, that of the beginning of its decline, under Amurath III., to a temporary restoration of former power and dominion, under Amurath IV., to 1640, of 66 years.

5.—The fifth, of anarchy, tumult, and revolt, to 1656, of sixteen years.

6.—The sixth, one of renewed energy under the auspices of the Kiuprili functionaries of State, down to the disastrous war with Austria, and the treaty of peace of Carlovitz, in 1688, of 32 years.

7.—The seventh, one of ruin and disaster, of national calamities following in quick succession, of downfall without retrieval —terminating in the fatal treaty of Kainardji, with Russia; from 1688 to 1763, a period of 75 years.

It is reserved for a future historian to add to the preceding divisions one cycle more. The eighth period, probably to be described as one of lingering death, of a remnant of Mohammedan life existing in Turkey, on Christian sufferance, for which it is indebted to the strife and jealousies of the great European Powers; a period that must terminate in dissolution, that dates from 1763, and perhaps may include a century in its limits, or extend a few years beyond.

Sultan Mahmoud left three children:

1.—Abdul Medjid, born April 23, 1823, A.D., the era of the Hegira, 1255.

2.—Abdul Assis (or Azis), second son of Mahmoud, born February 9th, 1830.

3.—Adilah, daughter of Mahmoud, born in 1823, married to Mehemet Ali Pacha, in her 19th year.

The late Pacha, Abdul Medjid, succeeded to the Ottoman throne the second of July, 1839, when only sixteen years of age. He was provided at the onset of his career with an extensive establishment of the harem kind, and from the period of his accession to the beginning of the year 1861, he had sixteen children born to him, eight sons, and as many daughters.

Before he was twenty he had eight children by different inmates of the imperial seraglio, in the course of three years.

From the time the late Sultan commenced his career of reform, the chiefs of the religion of Islam, Mufti, Ulemas, Cadis, dervishes, fanatics of the empire in general, of Stamboul in

particular, began to think very favourably and to speak with eulogy of his brother, Abdul Assis. All their comparisons of the two brothers were to the prejudice of the late Sultan, on account of his reform principles, and his supposed indifference in matters affecting religion.

A clergyman of the Church of England, in a biographical memoir of the late Sultan, Abdul Medjid, gives the following interesting account of him:—

"While in Constantinople in 1850 I saw the Sultan repeatedly, and once to great advantage. He was then in his twenty-ninth year, and of the middle stature, with jet black hair, beard, and moustache, the latter closely trimmed: it is said, however, that the natural colour is red. His complexion is very pale, and he wears an aspect of the deepest melancholy. There is much kindness of expression in his large, dark, and yet sorrowful eye; his voice is singularly pleasing and musical. If the moralist wished to show how little the possession of despotic power could do to secure happiness, he need look no farther than the countenance of this kind hearted and most interesting prince. He has been much misrepresented by those who wish to depict the Turks as mere barbarians; and an impression has been created that he is deficient alike in intellect and energy. Had he been either the one or the other, he would not—could not have done the deeds which are related of him. Every anecdote heard in his capital is calculated to exhibit him as a man of much originality and decision; mild and amiable, but quite capable of insisting on his own way, and of judging very rightly what way he ought to take. That he is enlightened, in the European sense—that is actually, practically with science and literature—cannot be said; but he is right-minded and just, and knows well that what is morally wrong, cannot be politically right.

"His education has been limited, for when his father, desirous to secure for him those advantages, of which he so keenly felt the want himself, had arranged with a French gentleman of ability and great scientific attainments, to become tutor to the young heir, the Grand Mufti, who was necessarily consulted,

contrived to quash the plan. Mahmoud had stipulated that the tutor should live entirely with his royal pupil, and be the companion of his relaxations as well as of his studies: and had this been carried out, Abdul Medjid would, in all probability, have enjoyed a state of health very different from that in which he has now the misfortune to be, and have done credit to his instructor by his progress in learning. When the Grand Mufti was called for his opinion, he issued a fetva, in which he was pleased to observe, that a prince of the prophet's blood, and who was destined one day to ascend the throne of the caliphs, could not lawfully be educated by a giaour. Mahmoud, though extremely irritated at this absurd proceeding, felt, nevertheless that to oppose it would be dangerous, and reluctantly consented to abandon his beloved son to the darkness of a harem. However, the Sultana Valide, who was the trusted and favoured wife of Mahmoud, seems to have been successful in instilling good principles into the mind of her son, where they took root, as in a congenial soul, and we can only lament with Mahmoud, that his intellect was not equally cultivated. As soon as he ascended the throne, he displayed the natural bent of his character; he surrounded himself with Europeans of learning and science; and though he had no peculiar love for reading, he yet contrived to pick up a great deal of miscellaneous and useful information. He is said to labour under a difficulty of attaining foreign languages, and this may be the chief cause of the unfavourable estimates sometimes made of his abilities—a test, it must be admitted, extremely fallacious.

"One or two anecdotes will put his character in its true light. During the year of famine in Ireland, the Sultan heard of the distress existing in that unhappy country; he immediately conveyed to the British ambassador his desire to aid in its relief, and tendered for that purpose a large sum of money. It was intimated to him that it was thought right to limit the sum subscribed by the Queen, and a larger amount could not, therefore be received from his highness. He at once acquiesced in the propriety of this resolution, and with many expressions

of benevolent sympathy, sent the greatest admissible subscription.

"It is well known that his own personal feeling dictated the noble reply of the Divan to the threatening demands of Austria and Russia for the extradition of the Polish and Hungarian refugees, in 1848. 'I am not ignorant,' was his reply, 'of the power of those empires, nor of the ulterior measures to which their intimations point; but I am compelled by my religion to observe the laws of hospitality; and I believe that the sense and good feeling of Europe will not allow my government to be drawn into a ruinous war, because I resolve strictly and solemly to adhere to them.'"*

Commander Lynch, of the American navy, gave an accurate and graphic account of Abdul Medjid, in a notice of an interview with the young Sultan, in February, 1848.

"We ascended the stairway, which was covered with a good and comfortable, but not a costly carpet, and passed into a room more handsomely furnished and more lofty, but in every other respect of the same dimensions as the one immediately below it. A rich carpet was upon the floor; a magnificent chandelier all crystal and gold, was suspended from the ceiling; and costly divans and tables, with other articles of furniture, were interspersed about the room. But I had not time to note them, for on the left hung a gorgeous crimson velvet curtain, embroidered and fringed with gold (the ancient Tartar one was of felt), and towards it the secretary led the way. His countenance and manner exhibited more awe than I had ever seen depicted in the human countenance. He seemed to hold his breath, and his step was so soft and stealthy, that once or twice I stopped, under the impression that I had left him behind, but found him ever beside me. There were three of us in close proximity, and the stairway was lined with officers and attendants; but such was the death-like stillness, that I could distinctly hear my own

* "The Sultan of Turkey, Abdul Medjid Khan," by the Rev. Henry Christmas, M.A. Lon. 12mo, 1854. pp. 20, 21.

footfall. If it had been a wild beast slumbering in his lair, that we were about to visit, there could not have been a silence more deeply hushed."

This doubtless was no mere court etiquette; it was the expression of the faith which is the vital principle of the Ottoman State, that the Sultan is the ordained representative and delegate of Almighty God. Our author continues:

"Fretted at such abject servility, I quickened my pace towards the curtain, when Sheffir Bey, rather gliding than stepping before me, cautiously and slowly raised a corner for me to pass. Wondering at his subdued and terror-stricken attitude, I stepped across the threshold, and felt, without yet perceiving it, that I was in the presence of the Sultan. The heavy folds of the window curtains so obscured the light, that it seemed as if the day was drawing to a close, instead of being at its high meridian. . . . The room, less spacious, but as lofty as the adjoining one, was furnished in the modern European style, and like a familiar thing a stove stood nearly in the centre. On a sofa by a window, with a crimson tarbouch, its gold button and blue silk tassel on his head, a black kerchief around his neck, attired in a blue military frock and pantaloons, and polished French boots upon his feet, sat the monarch, without any of the attributes of sovereignty about him.

"A man, young in years, but evidently of impaired and delicate constitution, his wearied and spiritless air was unrelieved by any indication of intellectual energy.

"My feelings saddened as I looked upon the monarch, and I thought of Montezuma. Evidently, like northern climes, his year of life had known two seasons only, and he had leapt from youth to imbecility. His smile was one of the sweetest I had ever looked upon; his voice almost the most melodious I had ever heard; his manner was gentleness itself, and everything about him bespoke a kind and amiable disposition. He is said to be very affectionate, to his mother especially, and is generous to the extreme of prodigality. But there is that indescribably

sad expression in his countenance, which is thought to indicate an early death."

Captain Lynch also saw Abdul Medjid at mosque one Friday: "First came, walking backwards, the Imaum of the Dervishes, in a high green felt hat, swinging a censer filled with burning incense, and followed by a grave, melancholy looking young man, with a rather scanty black beard, the red tarbouch upon his head, and wearing a blue military frock coat, and fawn-coloured pantaloons; the coat fringed or laced, with a standing collar, fawn-coloured gloves upon his hands, and a short blue cloak thrown lightly over his shoulders. It was the Sultan. . Contrary to expectation he had dismounted outside, and his gait, as he passed us, was feeble, and almost tottering."

The late Sultan Abdul Medjid is said to have been the son of a Circassian slave. From some cause or other his energies of mind and body had suffered grievously. It does not appear that he had laboured under any pulmonary or scrofulous disease. His physiognomy was that of an intelligent person, yet very little intellectual energy was displayed by him. By all persons who had come into contact with him, it is acknowledged he was amiable, benevolent, tolerant, and well disposed, desirous of seeing European civilization introduced into Turkey, and all his father's projected reforms adopted.

But his health and strength were of the feeblest kind, his frame slender and fragile, and his look that of a dreamy person averse to exertion, and unfitted for it; inclined to goodness, mild, gentle, and well-intentioned.

For the remarkable manifestations of premature exhaustion of vital and mental energies, of *defaillance* mentioned in the preceding observations, various causes have been assigned. A German physician of some eminence in his profession, Dr. Oppenheim, who had been in the service of Sultan Mahmoud and on the Medical Staff, during the war with Russia in 1828 and 1829, in a work on Turkey of a high character, makes a singular reference to the impaired energies of the eldest son of Mah-

moud—Abdul Medjid, which condition he treats of as a state of stupefaction of the sensorum artificially produced for the purpose of rendering him incompetent for the discharge of public duties.

The German work of Dr. Oppenheim has been made the subject of an elaborate and extensive notice by one of the most eminent physicians Ireland ever produced, the late Dr. Graves, and from that notice the preceding passages are taken.

The terrible crime imputed to Sultan Mahmoud, of practising on the intellect of his son, is hardly more revolting than that of the strangling of his brother, Mustapha, on his elevation to the throne. It rests however on less reliable grounds than the latter atrocity. There is no positive evidence (there can be none) of the infamous practice having been carried into effect in this case. The result which is produced by it in other cases, seems to have existed in that of Mahmoud's successor, and that is all that can be said on the subject.

When Constantinople was captured by the Turks, and the devoted city sacked and pillaged by them in the memorable year 1453, the victorious Sultan, Mohammed II., made his triumphal entry the same day, but not until the terrible work of havoc and spoliation had been several hours in operation. One of the first places he entered was the famous church of San Sophia, when he, urging his horse with brutal impetuosity, rode into the Christian temple, and beneath the arched roof ordered the gilded cross which shone from the dome to be demolished, and replaced by the crescent. The order was soon obeyed—the beautiful frescoes and Mosaics, which adorned the church, were plastered over or white-washed, and, strange to say, the very efforts of the barbarians were instrumental to the preservation of those frescoes to our own times.

About ten years ago, an Italian architect, Signor Foscatti, was employed to repair the mosque of San Sophia. He removed the plaster which four centuries previously had been daubed over the unrivalled Mosaics, the dome, and walls of that glorious edifice, and thus marvellously revealed, after having

remained unseen and forgotten for upwards of four hundred years—they were beheld by M. Ubicini in 1852. The young Sultan, Abdul Medjid, was induced to visit the repaired mosque, and those wonderful remains of Byzantine art were shown to him. After contemplating for awhile with evident emotion the colossal but solemn figures of the Virgin, and of the Greek Emperor, he turned to the Christian architect and said:—

"It is against the precepts of our religion that such things should remain exposed on the walls of a place of worship. Cover up these pictures carefully, so that the plaster may be removed at any future period without injury to them, for God only knows the future, and He alone can tell for whom the building may be preserved."

Four months after his accession, Abdul-Medjid-Khan promulgated the celebrated imperial ordinance, proclaiming the intended reform inaugured by his predecessor.

This ordinance, designated the hatti sheriff of Gulzaneh,* comprehended in its programme the new administrative measures for the better government of the Turkish Empire, and the protection and security of its subjects, of all races, ranks, and creeds. The promised reforms took a definite shape in 1844, and were embodied in a charter called Tanzimat—a word denoting renovation.

The reforms ordained in the Tanzimat, comprise four distinct heads. 1st—Measures in relation to the supreme authority and councils of the Ottoman Empire. 2nd—To the adminis-

* The hatti sheriff of Gulzaneh was proclaimed on the 3rd of November, 1839, with all the solemnities of state in the presence of the Sultan, his court, and ministers, the chief functionary, civil, and military, the Mufti, and Ulemas, and Imaums—the three Christian patriarchs and chief rabbi of the Jews, the municipal authorities, and all the foreign ambassadors. The three grand objects to be carried into effect were—1st, to ensure perfect security of life and property to all subjects of the empire, Mussulmans or Rajas; 2nd, to institute a regular mode of imposing and collecting taxes; 3rd, to regulate the system of military levies, and fix the duration of military service. The Sultan engaged himself by oath to observe scrupulously the terms of this edict, and to sanction the measures that would be necessary to give effect to it. The Gulzaneh was given to the imperial edict, on account of its proclamation in a spacious building in one of the courts of the palace, Kasson called "the house of roses," constructed for the manufacture of confectionary for the Seraglio, but formerly used for holding the councils of the divan, and on certain festivals, still used by the Sultan for state levies.

trative and financial departments of government. 3rd—To the judicial offices and institutions of the state. 4th—To the military organization.

The preamble of the hatti sheriff of Gulhaneh, the foundation on which the "Tanzimat" is constructed is worthy of attention. It will be seen by the express terms of that much vaunted "charter," that "the glorious precepts of the Koran," the sacred law, and the regulations founded on it, are proclaimed by the Sultan Abdul-Medjid, and are looked to in this 19th century as they were in the beginning of the establishment of the rule and religion of Mohammedans, as the foundation of all legislation, state guidance, and civil government in the Turkish dominions. And moreover we find the young reforming Sultan's expectations of success in his career of renovation based on the faith of the Koran, "being full of faith in the assistance of the Most High, through the mediation of our prophet." The preamble of the Tanzimat is to the following effect:—

"It is known to all men, that in the early years of the Ottoman dominion the glorious precepts of the Koran, and the laws of the empire were honoured and obeyed. The empire consequently increased in power and in grandeur, and all its subjects enjoyed the highest degree of prosperity. But, from a succession of accidents, and a variety of causes within the last hundred and fifty years, the sacred law, and the regulations founded upon it, are no longer properly observed; and our former strength and prosperity are changed into weakness and poverty, because a nation must lose all stability when it ceases to observe the laws.

"These considerations are ever present to our mind; and since the day of our accession to the throne, our thoughts have been entirely occupied with projects for the public good—the amelioration of the state of our provinces, and the relief of the population. It must be evident to all who consider the geographical position of the Ottoman provinces, the fertility of the soil, the aptitude and intelligence of the inhabitants, that by

applying ourselves to discover the most effectual means, we may trust, with the blessing of God, to arrive, in the space of a few years, at the desired result. And, accordingly full of faith in the assistance of the Most High, through the mediation of our prophet, we have thought fit to endeavour, by new institutions, to procure for the provinces which compose the Ottoman Empire, the advantages of a good administration."

In addition to the Tanzimat, "being a collection of ordinances promulgated from time to time, for the reformation or removal of abuses, the hatti-sheriff of Gulhane, is to be considered as the charter of the new rights and privileges of the people, which originated with the late Sultan, that was read to the public assembly of the notabilities of the nation, deputies of all the rayah community, foreign ministers, in the presence of the Sultan, on the 2nd of November, 1839. The following passages explain the new principles on which taxes are to be levied, and revenue raised, without extortion, rapacity, and oppression.

"The assessment of regular and fixed taxes is a consideration of vital importance, since the State, having to provide for the defence of its territory, can only raise the means necessary for the maintenance of the army by contributions on the people. Although, thanks be to God, the inhabitants of this country have lately been freed from the curse of monopolies, formerly improperly looked upon as a source of revenue, a fatal practice still remains in force, although it cannot fail to give rise to the most disastrous consequences—it is that of venal corruption, known under the name of Htizam. According to this system of civil and financial practice, a district is abandoned to the arbitrary rule of one individual, but too often notorious for his rapacity, and the most cruel and most insatiable disposition; for, should this farmer of the revenue not be a virtuous man, he will have no other care but that tending to his own advantage.

"It becomes, then, necessary, for every member of the Ottoman society to be taxed according to a fixed rate, in proportion

to his means and circumstances, and that nothing further should be exacted from him, and that special laws should also fix and limit the expenses of the army and navy.

"Although we have already observed the defence of the country is a most important consideration, it becomes the duty of the inhabitants to supply soldiers for that purpose; it becomes essential to establish laws to regulate contingents which each district is to supply, according to the urgency of the moment, and to reduce the time of military service to four or five years; for it is at the same time doing an injustice, and inflicting a mortal blow on agriculture and industry, to take, without regard to the respective populations of each district, from one more, from other fewer men than they can afford to provide; and it is also reducing the soldier to despair, and contributing to the depopulation of the country, to retain them all their lives in the service. In short, without the different laws of which the necessity has been shown, there is neither, strength, riches, happiness, nor tranquillity for the empire, and it has to expect these blessings, so soon as these laws come into operation.

"It is therefore decreed, that in future the cause of every individual shall be tried publicly, according to our divine laws, after mature inquiry and examination; and till a regular sentence has been pronounced, no one shall have it in his power, either secretly or publicly, to put an individual to death, either by poison, or by any other means.

"It is not permitted to attack the honour of any individual, unless before a court of justice.

"Every individual shall be allowed to be master of his own property, of whatsoever kind, and shall be allowed to dispose of it with full liberty; without any obstacle being offered by any one. For instance, the innocent heirs of a criminal shall not forfeit their right to his property, nor shall the property of a criminal be any longer confiscated.

"These imperial concessions extend to all our subjects, of whatever religion or sect they may be, and these advantages they shall, without exception, enjoy.

"Thus we grant full security to the inhabitants of our empire of life, honour, and property, as we are bound to do, according to the text of our holy law.

"As to the other subjects, they are subsequently to be regulated after the decision of the enlightened members of our Council of Justice, the members of which will be increased according to necessity, which is to meet on certain days, which we shall appoint. Our ministers and dignitaries of the empire will assemble to establish laws for the security of life and property, and the assessment of taxes, and every member of these assemblies shall be free to express his opinion and to give his advice.

"Laws concerning the regulation of the military service will be debated at the military council, which will hold its meetings at the palace of the Seraskier.

"As soon as one law is settled, in order that it may be for ever valid, it shall be presented to us, and we shall honour it with our sanction, and to the head thereof we shall affix our imperial seal."

Since the above hatti-sheriff was issued, the following statement has appeared in the Turkish *Gazette:*

"The Sultan, ever since his accession, has most ardently desired to signalise his reign by the re-establishment of the Ottoman power on the basis of the common well being of his subjects. His efforts have on various occasions, been crowned with the most signal success; but one fundamental reform was requisite to crown his labours, and to assure to his people the benefits which he sought to confer upon them. The collection of the revenue has remained up to the present time, laden with abuse, oppressive to the subjects, and detrimental to the State. Numerous firmans have been issued, enquiries have taken place; but the Sultan, during his late journey through the provinces, having employed himself in examining into the state of the administration, has been convinced that no sensible improvement has been effected, and that more decisive measures are required.

"In order to proceed methodically in this reformation, his highness has ordered an extensive inquiry to be instituted, so as, on the one hand, to ascertain the amount of the contributions actually paid by each district, and, on the other, to ascertain the actual disbursements for the army, the marine, the arsenals, and the other military establishments.

"The council of the Porte has therefore been assembled in presence of the high functionaries of State, to deliberate on the best means for carrying the intention of his highness into execution; and after a long debate, it has been resolved as follows:—

"'That a table shall be constructed, exhibiting the sums received,—1st, for the treasury; 2nd, for the Vallis and Voivodes; 3rd, for the expenses of travelling functionaries; 4th, the amount of contributions in kind to different departments, paid in saltpetre, corn, timber, &c.; 5th, the value of labour to which certain towns and districts were liable, under the denomination of Angaria (*corvée*); 6th, the sums paid for local police, judges, &c.

"'That an exact statement or balance-sheet be prepared of the whole revenue, fixed and casual, of the State.

"'Henceforward every tax unauthorized by the ancient canon shall be abolished.

"'The properties of the high functionaries of the State, whether military or civil, and the persons attached to their services, shall be equally assessed with those of the nation.

"'Every exemption from taxation, and every privilege through which the common burdens were avoided, shall cease.

"'The imposts shall be imposed with complete impartiality, at a rate of so much per thousand, which shall yearly be settled in the month of March, according to the new ordinance.

"'Each individual shall receive a ticket bearing the seal of the community, stating the amount of his contributions, and these sums shall be entered in the public register of each municipality.

"'Men of recognised probity and intelligence shall be commissioned, at the public expense, to prosecute the necessary inquiries throughout the empire.

"'The above regulations shall immediately be carried into execution in the two provinces nearest to the capital, Broussa and Gallipoli, so that the effects and advantages of the change may be observed, and with the least possible delay extended to the remainder of the empire.

"'From the date of the execution of this order, the two provinces designated shall be exempt from the payment of the impost termed "Ichtisab" (internal customs).

"'The confiscation of private property shall in no instance be allowed. The government shall in no case appropriate to itself the property of individuals, except on the death of persons who have no heirs.

"'The government will reserve to itself the right of previous liquidation, in the case of a holder of government money dying without sufficient effects to cover his debts.'

"These regulations fixed by the Council of the Porte, have been confirmed by the High Council, and sanctioned by the Imperial Firman.

"As these present institutions have for their object to cause the religion, government, nation, and empire to reflourish, we solemnly bind ourselves to do nothing in contravention to them. As a pledge of our promise, it is our determination, having after them deposited in the hall which contains the glorious mantle of the prophet, in presence of all the Ulemas, and dignitaries, of the empire, to abide by these institutions in the name of God, and then order the Ulemas and grandees of the empire to take the same solemn oath. After that he who shall violate these institutions shall be liable, without any regard being paid to his rank, consideration, or credit, to corresponding punishment to his faults, after once it has been made clear.

"A penal code shall be drawn out to this effect.

"As every functionary receives at present a suitable salary, and as the pay of those who are not yet sufficiently rewarded, is

to be subsequently increased, rigorous laws will be promulgated against the sale of patronage, and places under government, which the divine law reprobates, and which is one of the principal causes of the downfall of the empire.

"The above resolutions being a complete renovation of ancient customs, this imperial decree shall be published at Constantinople, and in all the provinces of our empire, and shall be communicated officially to all the ambassadors of friendly powers residing at Constantinople, in order that they may be witnesses to the granting of these institutions, which, if it may please God are to endure for ever.

"May the Almighty God extend his protection to us all. Let those who may presume to violate the present institutions be the object of divine malediction, and be deprived of happiness now and for ever! Amen."

The Tanzimat reforms have led to the establishment of a university, intended to supply the defects of the old system of instruction still in the hands of the Ulema, without venturing, however, to interfere in any manner with the latter: to plans and projects of improvements in the administration in all the departments of the State, except the department with which the Sheik ul Islam and the Ulema have to do: to the promulgation of a reformed penal code, a declaration of equality before the law, the establishment of mixed courts of Commerce and of Justice, in certain cases where the subjects of European sovereigns are concerned; the admission of the evidence of Christians and Jews in Courts of Justice; the abolition of the capitation tax, and of the term rayah in official parlance.

By the Tanzimat every Pacha acting as a Governor of a province, is obliged to act in his government in conjunction with a council *(Shoorah)* chosen by the different communities, by the majority of which council he is to be directed in initiating any important proceeding.

The *Shoorah*, except in the cities and great towns of the empire, however, is of little advantage to the Jew and Christian rayahs. The Pachas take care to render the councils nugatory,

and even turn to their own advantage, by throwing all the responsibility of their oppressive acts on the council.

The Pachas appointed governors of provinces, and important towns and districts, invariably purchase their appointments by bribes in the shape of presents, or guarantees for specific sums of money, or regular yearly payments out of their official revenues. For this purpose they must always have recourse to the Armenian money lenders, usurers, and jobbers—the *seraffs*, and have to pay an enormous rate of interest for the accommodation or guarantees given by them.

Usury is expressly condemned by the Koran, but the Sultan, as well as his Pachas, countenance the practise prohibited by their law. A Mussulman cannot take any interest on money; but he pays heavily to the giaours of London and Paris, interest for money lent by them; and the Pachas still more heavily for money lent to them by the "kelps" of Christians, the Armenian "dogs," and Rayahs of Stamboul.

Among the real reforms of Abdul Medjid may be classed the discontinuance of the service of the white eunuchs. He has pensioned those who exist, and discontinued the attendance of this order of servants of his seraglio for ever.

"It is said, but untruly, that the slave market of Constantinople has been abolished. An edict, it is true, was some years since promulgated, which declared the purchase and sale of slaves to be unlawful; the prohibition, however, is only operative against the Franks, under which term the Greeks are included.

"Every coloured person, employed by the government, receives monthly wages; and, if a slave, is emancipated at the expiration of seven years, when he becomes eligible to any office beneath the sovereignty. Many of the high dignitaries of the empire were originally slaves; the present Governor of the Dardanelles is a black, and was, a short time since, freed from servitude." *

* Commander Lynch, of the American Navy,—"Narrative of an Expedition to the Dead Sea and the Jordan, in 1847-8.

One of the ordinances of the late humane Sultan, most worthy of praise, was one prohibiting the punishment of death without the Imperial sanction of the sentence.

The reforms of the Sultan travelled over bad routes—slowly and not surely—in a crazy, ill-contrived waggon, on old lumbering wheels, with a team of horses attempting to drag it forward, and one of oxen lugging at the tail to hold it back.

I believe it is a recognized axiom in law, that no remedial measure, embodied in an act of parliament, is of use or benefit unless it has in it an administrative principle.

If the Tanzimat has not that principle, and has no power of creating it; has no machinery of a governmental, judicial, and policial kind, to work the proposed reforms out, and there are no means at the command of its framer of procuring that machinery, it is hardly necessary to say that the remedial law must be a dead letter.

In the Ottoman Empire the state is not only inseparably bound up with the church, but it is the creature and slave of the church. The Koran is all in all in Turkish jurisprudence, civil polity, science, and society. The Empire, in fact, is only an administrative machine for carrying into effect the divine rule laid down in the Koran. To reform the Government would be, in reality, to innovate on those religious doctrines supposed to be enjoined in the Koran, or defined by orthodox commentators, duly recognized by colleges of Ulemas. Nay, to secure for Christians the privileges and concessions extorted by France and England from the Ottoman Porte, at the close of the Crimean war, was to cause the Sultan and the Sublime Porte to violate the sacred injunctions of the Koran, and to sow the seeds of mortal discord and deadly animosity between them and the Ulemas.

A few years only have passed over since the famous Hatti Humayoum was promulgated by the Ottoman Porte, at the urgent instance of the Christian Allied Powers, conferring certain privileges on Christian subjects, and the Rayahs in general of the Ottoman Empire, sojourning in its various

provinces. Important reforms, on paper, were promised and propounded. Mixed tribunals of justice were established, civil and commercial, to take cognizance of cases of litigation between Franks and Moslems, in some of the principal commercial towns of the Levant—Smyrna, Salonica, Adrianople, Beyrout and Alexandria. In these mixed courts one-half of the Assessors were to be natives, the other half foreigners—the latter varying according to the nationality of the Frank who is a party to the proceeding. The use of the bastinado, and the punishment of death, is not allowed to be resorted to by these mixed courts.

If the accused party be a foreigner, his consul, or some person delegated by him, was required to be present at the trial, and no sentence affecting him could be executed except by the sanction of a consul or his representative.

The greatest innovation on the religion of Islam, occasioned by the late concessions to Christian subjects, is the privilege accorded to them of giving evidence as witnesses, in all cases where Christians may be implicated—hitherto, their evidence being inadmissible in any court of law. And, by a still later edict, this privilege is extended to Christians to give evidence in all courts of law in the Ottoman dominions, though exclusively Mohammedan in their constitution and jurisdiction.

During late years a reform has been attempted in education, perhaps of more importance than that relating to the administration of justice. Formerly, education was entirely in the hands of the ministers of religion, and under the entire control of the Ulemas. The primary schools, under the administration of what is called the *mekteb*, remain, however, unchanged; and these schools exist in considerable numbers in all large cities, in all towns, and even villages. Everybody who has travelled in the Turkish dominions must have noticed the many schools that are to be met with, thronged with children from six or seven years of age to ten and twelve—each squatted on the floor, rocking his body backwards and forwards, and afterwards all reading aloud from boards in their hands, with the letters

of the alphabet, or sentences from the Alkoran, or forms of prayer adapted to the several hours set apart for worship.

The religious teaching of children is eminently calculated, however, to make fanaticism long-lived in Turkey.

I have seen a common catechism for children, wherein the moral obligation of fighting against all who oppose the Koran, is laid down in the most explicit terms.

What reformation is to be expected in a state where children are taught such duties as are enjoined in the following doctrine?—

Question—"How must religion be promoted?"

Answer—"By fighting against all who oppose the Koran, till the infidels are cut off from the earth."

Question—"How do you serve the Sultan?"

Answer—"By making my head his footstool; by living and dying at his pleasure."

There are many parts of this catechism, enjoining belief in the unity of God, worthy of a better religion. But, however unobjectionable some of the doctrines may be, those of an objectionable character preponderate.

These primary schools exert a powerful influence over the whole Turkish population. The education given in them is gratuitous, and the religious element, fortunately for the law of Islam, is neither prescribed nor restricted in it. The secular instruction the children receive is entirely elementary—reading, writing, and arithmetic. It has been estimated that there is not above one Mussulman in twenty who has not attended, at some period, an elementary school of this kind.

Since 1846 this primary education has been, not only gratuitous, but compulsory, and the state intervenes in it. For the first time, also, a gratuitous system of secondary education was established for young men and adolescents in the chief cities.

For those of the higher order—the favoured class—sons and brothers of Ulemas, bureaucrats of all grades, *protegées* of Pachas, Viziers, courtiers, and officials of the Seraglio, there

have always been public acadamies, called Medressehs attached to mosques, and supported by the funds of the latter. These institutions date so far back, in Constantinople, as the time of the conqueror Mahmoud the Second. The number in Constantinople extends to some hundreds. They abound in other great cities of Syria and Egypt. They are administered by the Ulemas—not with a view, indeed, to the intellectual advantages of their countrymen, but to their own interests. They are not frequented, or organised, for the purpose of being serviceable to the public.

Among the reform efforts, in regard to education, either commenced by Sultan Mahmoud and adopted by his successor, or initiated by the latter, may be classed the following:—

1.—The appointment of a commission, with an inspector-general of public instruction at the head of it, for an educational mission to France, Germany, and England, to enquire into the various educational systems in those countries, and to report thereon to the Turkish government.

2.—The establishment of special schools on European principles, in Constantinople; two of which are on the model of the French system of instruction.

3.—The establishment of a normal school of instruction.

4.—The establishment of an imperial school of medicine, open alike to Mohammedans, Jews, and Christians.

5.—The establishment of a military college, on the plan and principle of the Collège de St. Cyr, in Paris—all the professors being French officers.

6.—The establishment of six preparatory schools, at Broussa, Damascus, and Bagdad, to supply students for the Imperial Military College in the capital.

7.—The establishment of an imperial school of engineering, to supply officers for the corps of artillery and engineers.

8.—The establishment of a school of agriculture.

9.—The establishment of a press in Constantinople, and production of several Turkish works, and some foreign ones, on industrial subjects.

To comprehend the reforms in the administration of justice, promised in the Tanzimat, it is necessary to have some idea of existing legal institutions, and the functionaries of them.

The courts of justice, over which the power and influence of the Muftis are exerted throughout Turkey proper, are twenty-two—termed *Medliviets* and Mehkamees—great legal tribunals, and also two courts of appeal.

There are military tribunals also, which are subject to the latter.

The Sheik-(ul)-Islam is next in rank to the Grand Vizier, and is at the head of this corps of Ulemas.

The Chief Judge, who is chosen always from the most distinguished of this corps, has jurisdiction over many governments.

The fundamental law of the Turkish Empire is the Koran—a system of organized fanaticism, hypocrisy, and fraud. The administrators of the law of Islam are theologians. Theologians are as apt to differ in Turkey as elsewhere; but, as all differences must ultimately revert to the Muftis, they contrive to turn them to a profitable account, and are notoriously open to bribes, and their courts are accordingly thronged by the agents and instruments of corruption—men who buy the judges, and others who sell their evidence to the highest bidder.

An observation I have previously made is illustrated by the position of the Mufti in the civil and ecclesiastical government of the state.

In official rank, the Mufti figures in the second place. Yet he occupies the first position in point of eminence and authority. The Mufti, the head functionary in all matters relating to religious worship, is second in the list of functionaries of state. The Cadi, who is the civil magistrate, has precedence of him; though, in his ecclesiastical functions, the Mufti interprets the divine law, and defines the legal doctrines derived from its revelation in the Koran, on which the Cadi has to act—so that the authority of the sacerdotal functionary is really paramount in the administration of the civil and

criminal law; it is, in effect, the chief element in the government of the Ottoman Empire.

The ecclesiastical and juridical hierarchy of the Ulemas, forms an important component part of the constitution of the state. This hierarchy consists of three classes of functionaries:

Cadis—Who are charged with the administration of justice; magistrates and judges.

Muftis.—First in eminence, though second in official order. Officers who are interpreters and definers of the law of Islam, and of all the applications of it to civil and criminal jurisprudence. These functionaries correspond to our doctors in theology, canonists, and judges of ecclesiastical courts.

Imaams.—Superior ministers, who officiate in sacred ceremonies, and assist in marriage and funeral ceremonies; divided into several categories—Sheiks, preachers; Khatibs, readers; Muezzins, callers to prayers, who announce the five prescribed hours of prayer from the minarets.

Caynims Bisalli.—Inferior priests, who are charged with the ordinary functions of priests in the mosques.

The corps of Ulemas has at once the power of an oligarchy, an aristocracy, a bureaucracy, sacerdotal and juridical; the power, moreover, of enormous wealth, confided to its charge for pious and charitable uses; and of immense influence over the Sultan, as having the direction of his conscience in all matters affecting the interests of religion; which interests, like the Ulemas of some other creeds not Turkish, they are apt to consider as identical with the interests of their order.

Their corps is the only corporation recognised by the state, and it can easily be imagined how formidable the *esprit de corps* must be, of so influential a body, in opposition to any reforms affecting the interests of their order.

In the meantime, the late Sultan was induced by the ambassadors of England and France to carry the war of reform against fanaticism into the camp of the Ulemas.

Mohammed Ali began this warfare, in Egypt, with the spoliation of church property, and the massacre of the Mamelukes, in 1811.

The late Sultan Mahmoud inaugurated his first reform movement in Turkey by the massacre of the Janissaries, in 1826.

But it has been found that more formidable enemies of Reform than the Janissaries exist in the Turkish Empire; possessing vast influence and great privileges and prestige, on account of their sacred character.

Abdul Medjid has been counselled by his Christian allies and advisers to undermine this sacerdotal power, to appoint commissions of inquiry, and to make investigations into the administration of the vast funds accumulated, and invested in church property for pious and charitable purposes, the object of which inquiries is perfectly understood by the Ulemas, namely—in due time to convert these sacred funds to secular purposes, to make it applicable to objects connected with foreign loans, and an enormously increased state expenditure, far exceeding the ordinary sources of revenue at the present time.

That increased expenditure is owing in a considerable extent to the costly efforts of the late Sultan Mahmoud, to introduce reforms, either premature, impracticable, or only temporary ameliorations.

In January, 1809, when war between Turkey and Russia was about to commence, Sultan Mahmoud II., finding the finances of the empire so embarrassed that the government of the country could hardly be carried on, applied to the British Ambassador to obtain a loan for him from England, but the application was fruitless, though his minister informed the ambassador "that it was intended to propose that the mufti, the ulema, and the whole body of their law should join in an act pledging the revenue appropriated to the maintenance of their religion for the repayment of the sum borrowed." Sultan Mahmoud was a bold man: many a Mussulman Prince has been bow strung for words of less offence to the vested rights of the sacred order of the ulemas, &c., than those uttered by Sultan Mahmoud.

The Turks, for about four centuries, have been in possession

of their empire in Europe, Asia, and Africa, comprising territory of vast magnitude. And amongst the regions of it on the shores of the Mediterranean, some of the finest and most fertile countries in the world.

To what account have they turned the advantages of their conquests and acquisitions?

Have they cultivated those vast regions? are they well populated? are the people well governed? No: the evil genius of the Mohammedan religion still casts its dark shadow over them. The depopulated country, and the uncultivated soil, cannot be affected by the new reforms.

I am confident I speak within bounds when I assert that upwards of two-thirds of the soil of Asia Minor, belonging to the Turkish Empire, is uncultivated, and has ever been so since it belonged to the Turks. Some thirty years ago, I made a land journey of three hundred miles on horseback, travelling with the Post Tartar courier, from Smyrna to Constantinople. This journey was accomplished in about five days and nights, almost continuous travelling, except for about two hours in the day, between two p.m. and four p.m. In this extensive journey we travelled over a champaign country of green sward, uncultivated, unmarked by any boundaries, unintersected by any roads, or tracks even of cattle. The soil was not sandy or sterile; on the contrary, the verdure on it was rich and luxurious, and yet there was no cultivation, and, in all probability, there never had been any, in all that vast region, since the Mohammedans had been its masters, except in the immediate vicinity of two large towns—Magnesia and Broussa, the only places through which we passed in that entire route. To say that the country is not half-peopled is an absurdity. The population of the region I speak of is not one-hundredth part, I presume, of what the population would be of a similar area of fertile land in England.

The interior of Turkey affords only patches of land in the vicinity of widely-scattered towns and villages, cultivated in the rudest possible manner. Wild tribes of Kurds, Turcoman

Arabs, and Druses, are the denizens of those scattered towns and villages, and the stock which supplies agricultural offshoots for the oasis in those wildernesses of verdure which exist in the Turkish Empire.

There are rich harvests, indeed, reaped in the rich plains of Konia Kaisaria and Pergama, in the central regions of South America; thanks to the extraordinary fertility of the soil, and the vivifying effects of the climate on the seeds that are cast on it—not to the skill, industry, or well-regulated labour of man.

In the broadest sense of the terms I employ, the soil of the Turkish Empire in Europe and in Asia Minor, is not turned to the account of the scant population of those regions; and it might be made available for the sustenance of at least half the population of Europe.

The terrestrial Paradise has been assigned to certain regions in Asia Minor, which form part of the dominions of Turkey. Most assuredly the finest regions of the globe, whether as regards excellence of climate, soil, and local situation, are those which form a part of that Empire.

Those regions are used and enjoyed, not for their agricultural products, their manufactures, and their commerce, but for the extended surface afforded to the rulers of this vast territory for farming taxes on wretched towns and villages, for selling governments, for deriving revenue from corrupt judges, commanders of troops, and functionaries of police.

The want of roads throughout the length and breadth of an empire, over which Turkish rule has subsisted four hundred years, is alone a sufficient argument against the existence of this semi-barbarism in the finest regions of the globe. The first attempt at road-making was made in 1848, when it was attempted to establish a diligence between Adrianople and Constantinople, a distance of one hundred and forty miles. The result was, that the journey occupied six days, and in a few months the project had to be abandoned. Another effort is now making to open a road between Erzeroum and Trebizond.

A trial has been lately made to deceive Europeans, with respect to agricultural advantages offered of grants of land, and cessions of extensive districts of fertile soil, in Asia Minor, on terms apparently exceedingly favourable, sanctioned by the Sultan. Europeans, however, would be mad to think of accepting such grants, or purchasing any such allotments of territory. The Sultan has no power of protecting persons, either native or foreign, in the possession of any such territories.

All persons who have an accurate knowledge of Turkey augur badly for the permanent results of those reforms which have been extorted under the pressure of actual or impending calamities, or obtained by foreign diplomatic influence, intrigue, or interference. There is a dead weight of passive resistance, and inert, sluggish obstruction of brutish instincts, without brute force for the accomplishment of its purpose, opposed by the Ulemas to all efforts at Reform, which they regard, justly, as specially directed against their power and supremacy.

The principal agent, and Prime Minister of the late Sultan, in the great work of the renovation of Turkish institutions was Redschid Pacha. When modern travellers in Turkey had visited the capital, and been fortunate enough to have gained access to this high functionary of state, they have found him more liberal and philosophical, *more Gallico* and politically economical, *more Anglicé*, than they could have expected to see a Mohammedan statesman. They generally conversed with his highness on the state of the provinces they had most recently visited, or felt most interest in. Those who had been in Syria at any period during the past twenty years, would naturally speak of the lamentable impediments and obstacles, in the form of fanatical animosities, sectarian strife and schisms,—to the praiseworthy efforts of the Sultan and his highness the Prime Minister, or the Grand Vizier, to promote the interests of civilization. Redschid Pacha would say it was true, and much to be lamented indeed, that the efforts

made by his august master and himself to renovate the empire had been thwarted, to some extent, by the antipathies of the several component parts of a nation so heterogeneously composed as that of Turkey.

Unfortunately, the subjects of the Sultan were not of one race or religion. Those who came nearest to one another in origin or faith hated each other most. The Christains—Greeks, Maronites, Copts, and Armenians, of the Syrian, Latin, and schismatic Churches—had *formerly, in the times of ignorance and fanaticism*, been oppressed by the Mussulman rulers a good deal; but they hated one another a great deal more, as heretics and schismatics, than they did Moslems as infidels. They all, however, feared and detested the Druses, and the Druses despised and detested them, and had nothing in common with Moslems of the orthodox faith but a few dogmas of the Mohammedan religion—all that remained of it in the Ishmaelian Schiite sect from which they sprung. So that the Ottomans had a population of Turks, Arabs, Druses, Ansarys, Metowalis and Christians, of all churches, orthodox and heterodox, reciprocally regarding each other as aliens or enemies, perpetuating and transmitting ancestral strife and schism, feelings of aversion, and habits of isolation.

But the Turks had to overcome these obstacles, Redschid Pacha would say, that the new Reform would overcome them. The travellers who were not entirely overcome themselves, by their feelings of profound respect in the presence of the Grand Vizier, would venture to inquire by what means it was expected these obstacles were to be removed? Then the panacea for all ills that unreformed flesh is heir to in the Turkish dominion would be disclosed. The travellers would be informed by Reschid Pacha, the remedy for all the evils of Turkish governmental administration in the provinces was—*amalgamation!!!* The several conflicting populations, interests, prejudices, characters, policies, and polemics, were to be amalgamated. Education in the several provinces was to be directed solely to that end.

The great principle of all the modern schemes for reforma-

tion of Turkish institutions, morals, manners, and even religious sentiments, is, then, amalgamation of conflicting Rayah creeds and races throughout the Turkish Empire. In carrying into effect this plan, all intercourse and relations between the ruling powers and its subjects, Moslem and Rayahs, was to be directed towards this great project and principle of regeneration—amalgamation. Alas! for Turkey and its rulers! This day-dream of modern political philosophy is not destined to be realised. It must vanish, as all dreams do, and leave not a wreck behind.

But the most important of all the results of stretching the plain and obvious meaning of injunctions in the Koran, so as to make several of these reforms, that are at direct variance with the law of Islam, seem to be in conformity with it, is the effect that is produced on the faith of the mass of the people, causing them to waver in it, to be indifferent in matters of belief of fundamental importance in their religion, and yet retaining all the fanaticism of it, and manifesting it more offensively than ever in all their relations with Christians—with whom they imagine these reforms originated.

The zeal for Reform in Sultan Mahmoud and his son Abdul Medjid, was not calculated to encourage zeal for the law of Islam, for the religion of Mohammed, in the great body of the people. Quite the reverse; it had had the effect of deadening faith in the minds of uncultivated people, nay, even of people of notoriety for their intelligence and acquirements. But what is to become of this people when their faith in their religion is gone, or all but extinguished utterly, when nothing has been substituted, or likely to be substituted.

If we are to judge of the veneration in which the memories of Mohammed and his cousin Ali, the son of Abou Thaleb, are held at this day, by the number of pilgrims who visit their sepulchres, we should suppose the veneration of the Schiites for the memory of the martyr, Caliph Ali, stronger than that of the Sonnites for the memory of the prophet and founder of the faith of Islam.

Mr. Levic, formerly British Consul, now Postmaster at Suez,

in a written communication to Lieutenant Burton, author of "A Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina," published in 1855, says :—

"It appears that the number of pilgrims who pass through Suez to Mecca, has of late been steadily on the decrease : when I first came here in 1838, the pilgrims who annually embarked at this port amounted to between 10,000 and 12,000. The shipping was then more numerous, and the merchants more numerous. I have ascertained from a special register kept in the government archives, that in the Moslem year 1268, from 1851 to 1852 A.D., the exact number that passed through was 4,893. From 1852 to 1853 A.D. (in 1263 of the Hegira) it had shrunk to 3,136. The natives assign various causes for the falling off, which I attribute chiefly to the indirect effect of European civilization upon the Moslem powers immediately in contact with it."*

Mr. Loftus in his "Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susia" (published in 1857), says he visited the tomb of Ali, a shrine and sepulchre of the martyred caliph, held in more veneration perhaps, at this day, by the sect of the Shiites than those of the Prophet Mohammed, at Mecca, by the orthodox Sonnites." And I may here observe, that it is not a little singular, that those shrines and sepulchres, so renowned and venerated, are only supposed to be, by the best informed writers, who have visited those "holy places," *belles cages vides*, gorgeous tombs without their tenants.

Burton, who visited the tomb, but not the coffin of Mohammed, believes the body of the prophet is no longer there. Loftus, whose last visit to Kufa and Nedjef was in 1853, is extremely doubtful if Ali was interred at Nedjef, the place of pilgrimage of so many thousands of his followers, or if interred there, if his remains at this day exist where they were buried.

Mr. Loftus estimated the number of pilgrims on an average of some years, was eighty thousand a year, and the number of

* Burton's "Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina," vol i. p. 260.

corpses that were carried there to be interred, from 5,000 to 8,000 a year.

Of Cufa, or Kufa, or Cufi, a city of great antiquity, of which mention is made in the oldest Arabic and Persian records, nothing now remains but a few low mounds and fragments of walls, on the site of it, on the Bahr Kufa, a branch of the Euphrates. Seven miles distant is the site of another ancient city, or rather town, Hira, now named Nedjef, where the son-in-law, and cousin, and first disciple and adherent of the prophet was assassinated, his remains were interred, and a magnificent mosque has been erected over his tomb.

The decline of fanaticism referred to by Burton is a sign and token of the downfall of Turkish power.

In 1824 the following opinions were expressed by me, in a letter written in Constantinople, on the decline of the Turkish Empire:—

"Manifest as the interest of England may be, to prop up the tottering empire of the Turks, its subsistence depends not on her efforts; and the energy of the present Sultan Mahmoud can only procrastinate its fall. Every writer on Turkey for one hundred and fifty years, has been anticipating this event; the evil in her institutions has been long observed; but it is only now the mischief of misrule has seized her vitals, and such a result might, sooner or later, be well expected in an empire suddenly raised to an intoxicating height on the ruin of many conquered nations, deriving all its riches from plunder, and none from native industry, or the improvement of its acquired advantages. I mean to say that Turkey is impoverished to that degree, that there is not a Mussulman in the empire who will not acknowledge that his circumstances are impaired. A respectable and well-informed Syrian Turk, assured me that his province was reduced to such wretchedness, that he wished the English would come and take his country; nay, if they would not come, he would welcome the very Greeks. This was literally his language, and sufficiently strong and desperate for a Turk. I say, no decided change or amelioration in the condition of the people can be ex-

pected, because their civil and religious institutions are diametrically opposed to civilization, and are like the laws of the Medes and Persians, immutable.

One great source of the prevailing ignorance and delusion of the Turks of all ranks, is their pride and arrogance; they look with contempt on all civilized nations, and make physical force the criterion of moral power. They describe Alexander, about whom they are very fond of talking, as a monstrous giant, and Cæsar as a great commander of superhuman stature.

"I have often had to observe, in my intercourse with this people, that gentleness and civility were received as the homage of inferior to superior beings; to be respected Europeans find it necessary to be haughty, even to the highest, and to be arrogant, to avoid being slighted or affronted."*

"No race cast so broad and dark a shadow on the page of ecclesiastical history, and leaves so painful an impression on minds of the reader, as the Turkish. The unhappy race of whom I am speaking, from the first moment they appear in the history of Christendom, are its unmitigated, its obstinate, its consistent foes. They are inexhaustible in numbers, pouring down upon the South and West, and taking one and the same terrible mould of misbelief, as they successively descend. They have the populousness of the North, with the fire of the South; the resources of Tartars, with the fanaticism of Saracens. And when their strength declines, and age steals upon them, there is no softening, no misgiving, they die and make no sign. In the words of the wise man, 'Being born, they forthwith cease to be; and have been able to show no mark of virtue, but are consumed in wickedness.' God's judgments, God's mercies are inscrutable; one nation is taken, another is left. It is a mystery, but the fact stands; since the year 1048 the Turks have been the great Antichrist among the races of men."†

* Madden's "Travels in the East," vol. i. p. 70.

† Lectures on the History of Turkey. Lon. 1854.

CHAPTER XX.

The Causes and Results of the late War with Russia.
1853—1855.

THE causes and results of the late war of England, France, and Turkey, with Russia, have too important a bearing on the subject of this work to be left unnoticed, however recent is the great struggle with which they are connected. With the details, however, of that war I have not to trouble my readers.

An unmistakable proof of the existence of the old Russian design, originating with the Prince Potemkin, in the reign of the Empress Catherine,—the dismemberment of Turkey, is to be found in a project to be accomplished with the acquiescence of England, which was communicated to the English Cabinet on the occasion of the visit to England of the Emperor Nicholas, in 1844. This long-cherished design—frequently denied (and that most solemnly), often suspended, on all opportune occasions and plausible pretexts revived, in adverse circumstances postponed, but never relinquished—was again acted on in those memorable conversations of the Emperor Nicholas with Sir Hamilton Seymour, the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, in the early part of 1853. In those communications of the Czar with the British Minister, the imperial burglar of other peoples territories very plainly and unreservedly proposed a great state robbery to England, counting, as it would seem,

implicitly—but erroneously, as it proved, in regard to Turkey —on the *annexational* propensities of Great Britain.

The astutely propounded burglary of the Emperor, divested of the formulas of state-craft phraseology, of the jargon of diplomacy, and the slang of the "haute politique," resolved itself into a proposal of this sort: "There is an excellent job, in the way of annexation, to be done in the house of my next-door neighbour, Turkey. The poor man is sick—in fact, moribund—he cannot defend his property. You and I can take it if we like. The *swag* is enormous. The lion's share of the sick man's possessions must, of course, be mine, as the contriver and chief doer of the job; but you shall have Egypt and Candia. You need not trouble your head about France; when you and I are joined in a spoliation of this kind, France dare not meddle with us; and as for Austria, we have nothing to fear from that poor creature. Austria is entirely dependent on my military power, and subservient to my policy."

Sultan Abdul Medjid having declined to die, or to accept the position of a sick man, or to transfer to Russia the sovereignty over thirteen millions of his subjects, passed the Pruth on the 3rd of June, 1853, and occupied Moldavia and Wallachia.*

A correspondence of the Emperor Nicholas with the English Minister of Foreign Affairs, in 1853, having been alluded to in the "St. Petersburgh Gazette," led to the secret correspondence being laid before Parliament, in huge volumes of blue books, between the British and Russian governments, relative to the affairs of Turkey, from January to April, 1853.

The British Cabinet being challenged by the "Journal of St. Petersburgh" to produce them, there was no hesitation on the part of the Government to lay the papers on the table of the House. This correspondence shows, that the Emperor began by intimating his conviction that Turkey was on the eve of ruin, adding, that her fall would be a great misfortune,

* Peace was concluded on the 30th of March, 1856.

and it was very important that England and Russia should come to a perfectly good understanding on these affairs, and *that neither should take any decisive step of which the other was not apprised.* The Emperor disclaimed the policy of Catherine II., as directed to the overthrow of the Turkish Empire. He asserted his right to the protection of the Christians of the Greek Church in the East, but said it gave rise to very inconvenient obligations, and he expressed his desire to come to an explanation with Sir H. Seymour; as a friend and a *gentleman*, lest the fall of Turkey should take Europe by surprise. He then declared, that if England ever intended to establish herself at Constantinople, that he should not permit it; but that he was equally ready to engage not to take Constantinople, at least, as his own, but he did not deny that circumstances might occur to induce him to occupy Constantinople as a guarantee. The British Cabinet replied, that they had no intention or wish to hold Constantinople, and that they would enter into no negotiation to provide for the contingency of the fall of Turkey without previous communication with the Emperor of Russia.

At this time Prince Menschikoff was on his way to Constantinople, and Sir Hamilton Seymour reported to his government that he had reason to believe that 144,000 men were ordered to march to the frontier of the Danubian principalities. On the 21st of February the Emperor reported to the British Ambassador his conviction that "the sick man was dying," and on the following day, explained himself more fully to Sir H. Seymour, "that he would not tolerate the permanent occupation of Constantinople by the Russians, his subjects, or by the French, or by the English, or by any other great nation: that he would never permit the attempt of the reconstruction of the Byzantine Empire, or such an extension of Greece as would render her a powerful state, still less, the breaking up of Turkey into little republics,—rather than submit to these arrangements, I would go to war as long as I have a man or a musket to carry it on; if, however, the Europeans rejected

all these expedients," (professing, at the same time, to believe that the dissolution of Turkey was inevitable) "nothing remained but the actual partition of her territories; he had no objection to see England take Egypt and Candia."

Sir H. Seymour, in a letter dated January 22nd, 1853, says: "I found his Majesty alone, he received me with great kindness, saying, that I had desired to speak to him upon Eastern affairs, that on his side there was no indisposition to do so, but that he must begin at a remote period.

"You know," his Majesty said, "the dreams and plans in which the Empress Catherine was in the habit of indulging: these were handed down to our time; but while I inherited immense territorial possessions, I did not inherit these visions —these intentions, if you like to call them. On the contrary, my country is so vast, so happily circumstanced in every way, that it would be unreasonable in me to desire more territory or more power than I possess; on the contrary, I am the first to tell you, that our great, perhaps our only danger is, that which would arise from the extension of an empire already too large.

"Close to us lies Turkey, and in our present condition, nothing better for our interests can be desired; the times have gone by when we had anything to fear from the fanatical spirit, or the military enterprise of the Turks, and yet the country is strong enough, or has hitherto been strong enough, to insure its independence, and to insure respectful treatment from other countries." . . . . . "Well, in that empire there are several millions of Christians, whose interests I am called upon to watch over, while the right to do so is secured to me by treaty. I may truly say that I make a moderate and sparing use of my right, and I will freely confess, that it is one attended with obligations occasionally very inconvenient; but I cannot recede from the discharge of a distinct duty. Our religion, as established in this country, came to us from the East, and there are feelings as well as obligations which must never be lost sight of.

"Now Turkey, in the condition which I have described, has, by degrees, fallen into such a state of decrepitude, that, as I told you the other night, eager as we all are for the prolonged existence of the man (and that I am as desirous as you can be for the continuance of his life, I beg you to believe), he may suddenly die upon our hands; we cannot resuscitate what is dead: if the Turkish Empire falls, it falls to rise no more; and I put it to you, therefore, whether it is not better to be provided beforehand for a contingency than to incur the chaos, confusion, and certainty of a European war, all of which must attend the catastrophe if it should occur unexpectedly, and before some ulterior system has been sketched. This is the point to which I am desirous to call the attention of your government."

In a subsequent interview of the ambassador with the Emperor, Sir H. Seymour communicated to his Majesty that he had received an answer from his Government to his conversation already related, which he was at liberty to transmit, when his Majesty said: "So you have got your answer, and you are to bring it to me to-morrow. I think your government does not so well understand my object. I am not so eager about what shall be done when the sick man dies, as I am to determine with England *what shall not be done* when that event takes place.

"I will tell you that if your government has been led to believe that Turkey retains any elements of existence, your government must have received incorrect information. I repeat to you that the sick man is dying, and we can never permit such an event to take us by surprise. We must come to some understanding, and this we should do, I am convinced, if I could hold but ten minutes conversation with your ministers—with Lord Aberdeen, for instance, who knows me so well, and who has full confidence in me, as I have in him. Remember that I do not wish for a treaty or a protocol; a general understanding is all I require; that between gentlemen is sufficient; and in this case I am confident that the confidence

would be as great on the part of the Queen's ministers as on mine. So no more at present; you will come to me to-morrow, and remember that, as often as you think your conversing with me will produce a good understanding upon any point, you will send word that you wish to see me."—(*Blue Books.*)

On the following day the British ambassador had the honour of another interview with the Emperor, which he "describes as one of the most interesting in which he had ever been engaged," and that it lasted an hour and twelve minutes; it related principally to Lord John Russell's despatch to the ambassador, dated February 9th, in reply to the conversation between his Imperial Majesty and the ambassador, which has been already related. In this despatch the British minister thus expressed himself, "No course of policy can be adopted, more wise, more beneficial to Europe, than that which his Imperial Majesty *has so long followed*, and which will render his name more illustrious than that of the most famous sovereigns who have sought immortality by unprovoked conquest, and ephemeral glory." Alluding to the probable dissolution of the Turkish Empire, the Emperor observed, "You have no elements of provincial or commercial government in Turkey; you would have Turks attacking Christians, Christians falling upon Turks, Christians of different sects quarrelling with each other, in short, chaos and anarchy." His Majesty next spoke of France, "God forbid (he said) that I should accuse anyone wrongfully, but there are circumstances, both at Constantinople and Montenegro, which are extremely suspicious; it looks very much as if the French government were endeavoring to embroil us in the East, hoping in this way better to arrive at their own objects, one of which, no doubt, is the possession of Tunis." . . . "As I before told you all I want is a good understanding with England, and this not as to what *shall*, but as to what shall *not* be done. This point arrived at, the English government and I, I and the English government, having entire confidence in one another's views, I care nothing about the rest. It is perfectly

true that the Empress Catherine indulged in all sorts of visions of ambition; but it is not less so, that these ideas are not at all shared by her descendants; you see how I am behaving towards the Sultan; this gentleman breaks his written word to me, and acts in a manner extremely displeasing to me, and I have contented myself with dispatching an ambassador to Constantinople to demand reparation. Certainly I could send an army there if I chose, there is nothing to stop them, but I have contented myself with such a show of force as will prove that I have no intention of being trifled with.

"It is impossible not to feel great interest in a population warmly attached to their religion, who have so long kept their ground against the Turks; and it may be fair to tell you, that if any attempts should be made at exterminating these people by Omar Pasha, and should a general rising of the Christians take place in consequence, the Sultan will, in all probability lose his throne; but in this case he falls to rise no more. I wish to support his authority; but if he loses it, it is gone for ever. The Turkish Empire is a thing to be tolerated, not to be reconstructed. In such a case I protest to you I will not allow a pistol to be fired." . . . "The Principalities, are, in fact, an independent State under my protection; this might so continue. Servia might receive the same form of government; so again with Bulgaria; there seems to be no reason why this province should not form an independent State. As to Egypt, I quite understand the importance of that province to England. I can then only say, that if, in the event of a distribution of the Ottoman Empire upon the fall of the empire, you should take possession of Egypt, I shall have no objections to offer. I would say the same thing of Candia; that island might suit you, and I don't know why it should not become an English possession."—*(Blue Book.)*

In dismissing the ambassador his Imperial Majesty said, "Well, induce your government to write again upon these subjects, to write more fully, and to do so without hesitation. I have confidence in the English government. It is not an

engagement nor a convention that I demand, but only a free exchange of ideas, and on the word of a gentleman that will suffice between us."

In a memorandum dated St. Petersburgh, February 21, 1853, it was expressly provided, "this discussion should remain what it ought to be, secret between the two sovereigns."

Lord Clarendon replied on the 6th March, to this memorandum, "That the British government perseveres in the belief, that Turkey still possesses the elements of existence, and that the hastening or indefinite postponement of an event which every Power of Europe is concerned in averting, will mainly depend on the policy of Russia herself towards the Porte; but that, in any case, England desires no territorial aggrandisement, and could be no party to a previous arrangement, from which she was to derive any such benefit; or to any understanding, however general, which was to be kept secret from the other Powers."

This correspondence was terminated by a "memorandum," recognising that England and Russia were completely in accord as to the measures to be avoided in the event of that contingency happening in the East, which both States desired to prevent, or, at least to postpone as long as possible; and the Emperor thus expressed himself to Sir Hamilton Seymour:— "When we, England and Russia are agreed, I am quite without anxiety as to the rest of Europe; it is immaterial what others may think or do. You understand that when I speak of Russia I speak of Austria likewise; what suits the one suits the other; our interests, as regards Turkey, are perfectly identical." Russia declared that she was ready to labour in conjunction with England, in the common task of prolonging the existence of the Turkish Empire, by removing all cause of apprehension on the subject of its dissolution. He added, that there now existed a memorandum of his intentions, and what he had promised his son was ready to perform. This memorandum bears date the 15th April, 1853, at which time Prince Menschikoff had addressed to the Porte the project of a *secret treaty*

(a copy of which was actually transmitted to England by Lord Stratford on the 11th April), endeavouring "to reinstate Russian influence in Turkey, on a conclusive basis, and in a commanding and stringent form."

These official documents conclude with a note of the Count Nesselrode to the British Minister at the Court of St. Petersburg, which terminates with the following passage:—

"The object for which Russia and England will have to come to an understanding may be expressed in the following manner:—1st. To seek to maintain the Ottoman Empire in its present state as long as that political combination shall be possible. 2nd. If we foresee that it must crumble to pieces, to enter into previous concert, as to everything relating to the establishment of a new order of things, intended to replace that which now exists, and, in conjunction with each other, to see that the change which may have occurred in the internal situation of that empire, shall not injuriously affect either the security of their own states, and the rights which the treaties assure to them respectively, or the maintenance of the balance of power in Europe. For the purpose thus stated, the policy of Russia and Austria as we have already said is closely united by the principle of perfect identity. If England, as the principal maritime power, acts in concert with them, it is to be supposed that France will be obliged to act in conformity with the course agreed upon between St. Petersburg, London, and Vienna."

It is a singular coincidence that the original cause of the greatest war of modern times, and the occasion of the first crusade in the 11th century, have been the same, namely, a quarrel with the Turks about the custody of "The Holy Places," in Palestine, and the protection of Christians in that country.

"The Holy Places," in Jerusalem are sanctuaries, shrines, sepulchres, and chapels, resorted to by pilgrims from different countries, as the localities of the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord, the chief of them being the shrine of the

holy sepulchre, the original church over which (that has long ceased to exist) was built by the Empress Helena, the mother of Constantine. In these places associated with events of solemn interest, where it might reasonably be supposed that at such hallowed spots, the possession of which has been so devoutly desired in all ages, there would have been peace and concord among Christians, but, on the contrary, the most deadly strife has prevailed there, blood has been abundantly shed, in the holy places, even in the shrine and temple of the sepulchre; and very disgraceful scenes have taken place to my own knowledge, in them, the actors being Christians of three churches hostile to each other, and the spectators of them being the common enemies of all—Mohammedans.

To have the custody of these holy places is one of the causes of quarrel, between the different communities and their great Christian Protectorate Powers, but it is not true that the possession of the keys of these holy places, is the sole origin of the war which was lately waged in the Crimea.

The first notice that we have of the custody of those sanctuaries and the protectorate over the Christians of Palestine dates as far back as A.D. 1535 when Francis I. took the Latin Christians in the Holy Land under his protection, and in virtue of a treaty with Selim I., in that year claimed for the Latin Christians the custody of the holy places.

This treaty was confirmed by another, in 1740, when the claims of France were again recognised to the Protectorate, *but the sanctuaries were not specified*, an accidental omission which has given rise to endless disputes between the Greek and Latin Christians. The Greek communities had been from as early a period in possession of some of the sanctuaries in Jerusalem and elsewhere in Palestine, and had a right to the use of certain portions of the others in the custody of the Latin Christians. Many, and even very dreadful conflicts have arisen between those communities in the Holy Land, on account of those ill-defined rights and privileges, particularly in 1757, and from 1808 down to 1819, and occasionally at much later periods.

The King of the French claimed a right to protect the pilgrims of the Latin faith, in virtue of the rank and title accorded to him by the Pontiff of Rome, of "Most Christian King;" whilst the Emperor of Russia, as "Head of the Greek Church" (a title which he inherits from Peter the Great), claims to protect the pilgrims of the Greek faith, in virtue of his imperial rank and title. In order to adjust the differences between the Greek and Latin churches in Syria, it was deemed necessary that both Russia and France should send an envoy to Palestine for the purpose of obtaining accurate information on the points in dispute. This proceeding gave hopes of an adjustment of these differences, but the Greek revolution in 1821 put an end to the negociations.

To settle the disputes between the communities of the Latin and Greek churches, in matters connected with the custody of the "holy places," has been for many years past a great difficulty with the Porte and the Russian, French, and English embassies in Constantinople. The Turkish government attempted to establish peace by a decree, promulgated in the Sultan's name, declaring, "that in future all Christian professions should enjoy the same privileges in respect of the 'holy places;'" but the decree failed to reconcile the rival parties. The Emperor of Russia asserts his rights to a Protectorate, in virtue of the celebrated treaty of Kianardji of 1744, the seventh article of which runs thus:—"The Sublime Porte promises constantly to protect the Christian religion, and the churches belonging to it; and also to permit the ministers of the imperial court of Russia to make, on all occasions, representations of those who belong to it, promising to take them into consideration, as coming from a person in the confidence of a neighbouring and sincere friendly power." This treaty guarantees to the subjects of the Emperor of Russia permission to visit the town of Jerusalem and the "holy places," without requiring of them, there or elsewhere, duty or contribution. It likewise authorises the Russians to construct a church of the Greek religion, in the quarter of

Galata, in addition to the chapel erected in the house of their embassy. It also permits Russia, on all occasions, to make representations on behalf of the church of Galata, and for those who have to do with it.

No serious political differences existed between France and Russia, with respect to the several claims of the Greek and Latin communities in Turkey, until 1830, when the Prince de Joinville, having visited Jerusalem, was solicited by the Latin monks of the holy city to use his influence with the French government for the protection of the interests of the Roman Catholic community, and for the restoration of their rights to the custody of some of the sanctuaries, long possessed by them, of which they had been deprived by the Greeks. The result of this application was a firman from Constantinople, ordering the custody of the sanctuaries referred to, to be restored to the Latins. But the Governor of Jerusalem found pretexts for not carrying the firman into execution; and for the risk he thereby encountered, was indemnified by the Greeks, and bribed to the extent of 500 purses.

In 1847, the subject was again forced on the attention of the Porte by the French government, to whom new complaints had been made by the Latins of the Holy Land; and especially on the subject of the abstraction of a silver star, which had been suspended over the spot held in veneration as the birth-place of our Saviour, at Bethlehem. These complaints were brought to the notice of the English government, by the British ambassador at the Porte, in 1850. The principal point at issue then, was the right of possession to certain portions of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.

The Greeks were accused, and I have reason to believe justly, of having usurped, not only portions of sanctuaries, but entire buildings, which belonged of right and by prescription to the Latins, and of having designedly allowed certain chapels in the Holy Sepulchre, and particularly the monuments of Godfrey de Bouillon and Guy de Lusignan, to fall into decay.

At the commencement of the quarrel, the affairs of the Christians in the East, and the relations of the sovereigns of the West with Turkey, in regard to them, stood in this position:—the Emperor of France and the Czar of Russia claimed certain protectional rights over the Latin and Greek communities in the Turkish Empire. The Latin Christians having suffered a great deal from the fanaticism, alike of Turks and Druses, addressed themselves to Louis Napoleon, to claim his mediation for them at the Porte, and this mediation went to the extent only of soliciting, as a favor, a concession of equal rights to the two churches; but the Czar became exceedingly angry, and demanded precedence for the Greek church. The conduct of the Sultan, it must be admitted by all parties, even by those least favourably disposed to the Turkish Empire, was straightforward and honorable. Russia showed its usual duplicity on this occasion, manifested an extravagant zeal for the interests of religion, and sought to promote them by an enormous amount of mendacity and insolence. The Russian plenipotentiary at the Porte, Prince Menschikoff, on the 16th of March, 1853, sent in a note complaining that the rights of Russia were injured by the late concessions to the Latin Christians, and demanded a separate treaty of recognition of the rights and privileges of the Greek Christians in the Ottoman Empire; and further, that Russia should be empowered to interpose, whenever it was necessary, as the protector of all Greek Christians in Syria.

On the 19th of the following month, Prince Menschikoff advanced in his demands, and extended the right of interference in behalf of Greek Christians to the whole empire of the Turks. This demand was refused by the Sultan; but he proposed to give the Emperor of Russia protectorate powers equal to those enjoyed by the Emperor of the French, and even some additional privileges, conveyed in two firmans, that would meet every possible emergency in Palestine. The Russian envoy refused any concession short of the Czar's original demand, and, on the 10th, sent in a copy of the

prescribed privileges insisted on by his master. The Sultan declared that he would willingly comply with anything which did not assail his independence; but to conclude a treaty conferring a power of interference between him and his subjects on a foreign power, would be a deadly blow at his sovereign rights. He would undertake, however, to support the liberties of all professing the Christian religion in his empire, and especially the Greek church. Menschikoff persisted in his demand, and on the 14th the ultimatum was to be given. After a change of ministry in Constantinople, and a delay of six days, Redschid Pacha, the new Minister for Foreign Affairs, placed before Menschikoff a proclamation, addressed to the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, promising that no future changes regarding the "holy places" should be made without the united agreement of Russia and France; permitted the erection of a Russian church and an asylum in Jerusalem, and even offered a formal act for the ratification of these promises: thus meeting all demands, except the treaty which was to confer on the Russian Czar the right of interfering in the government of the Turkish sovereign.

In 1851, M. de Lavalette, the French minister at the Porte, had warmly taken up the question of the "holy places." The Russian envoy had expressed to the Sultan his conviction that his master would allow of no changes in the custody of the sanctuaries. The French minister then offered to withdraw certain claims of the Latins, and to admit of a joint occupation of the places in dispute, when the Russian envoy demanded the joint occupation of *some other sanctuaries*, which had up to that time been exclusively occupied by the Latins. "Of these sanctuaries there were nine inside and eight outside Jerusalem, some of which had subsequently become the common property of the Latins and Greeks. There were ten sanctuaries which were common to all Christian nations, so far as regarded the right of performing religious ceremonies there; amongst them was that on Mount Calvary, and the Church of the Tomb of the Virgin."

In February, 1852, the Porte addressed a note to the French minister, promising certain concessions, but at the same time excluding the Latins from some privileges which had been granted to the Greeks. The French ambassador hereupon threatened to bring up the French fleet to the Dardanelles, if his demands were not complied with; whilst the Russian minister declared he would quit Constantinople immediately if the demands of his imperial master were not agreed to. On the other hand, the Russian envoy threatened the Porte with war, if a firman was not immediately issued settling the rights of the Greek Christians, and the public reading of that firman in Jerusalem. That the Czar has some right on his side is evident from the admission of Lord John Russell, in the House of Commons, that the Latin church had received certain advantages over those accorded to the Greek church, *in contravention of previous treaties.* And it would appear that M. Lavalette had exceeded his duty, in the opinion of his sovereign, for he was recalled.

The arrangement did not satisfy the Russian government, Prince Menschikoff was dispatched on a special mission to Constantinople, where he arrived on the 28th February, 1853, accompanied by Count Nesselrode as his secretary.

At this time a French fleet was hovering about the Mediterranean, and the Russian battalions were mustering on the Turkish borders of the Danubian provinces. This embassy augured ill to the Porte, an officer being chosen to conduct it who had distinguished himself in the late Russian war with the Turks, accompanied by a numerous suite, including a general officer and an admiral. This mission, although professing to be of a conciliatory character, was of a very warlike aspect and character.

The Russian ambassador's first communication to the Porte, was made on March the 10th, when the following demands were urged:—

1st. A firman concerning the key of the Church of Bethleham; the restoration of the silver star, and the possession of

certain sanctuaries. 2nd. An order for the repair of the dome and other parts of the holy sepulchre. 3rd. A "Sened," or convention, guaranteeing the strict *statu quo* of the privileges of "*The Catholic Greek Russian Faith of the Eastern Church*," and of the sanctuaries that are in possession of that faith, exclusively or in participation with other sects at Jerusalem.

The Porte granted all these demands, and firmans to that effect were sent to the Russian ambassador on May the 5th; but at a late hour of the same day Prince Menschikoff presented *another note*, demanding a "Sened," or convention, having the force of a treaty, the first article of which required, "that no change whatever shall be made in the rights, privileges, and immunities, which have been enjoyed or possessed, *ab antiquo*, by the Church, the pious institutions, and the clergy of the orthodox faith in the Ottoman States." The second article provided, "that all the rights and advantages conceded by the Porte, to other Christian sects, by treaty, convention, or *special grant*, shall be considered as belonging also to the orthodox church."

The last demand was not confined to *religious* privileges of the community of the Greek church, it claimed advantages for the greater part of the Christian population of Turkey, and possibly that affected the allegiance of a great part of the Sultan's Christian subjects.

The new foreign minister, Rifat Pacha, replied to these demands of the Russian ambassador in a temperate way on the 14th of May, stating the impossibility of their being complied with, and inviting the ambassador to a conference; but instead of accepting this conference, or even replying to the Pacha's note, the ambassador proceeded at once to the palace of the Sultan, and *demanded* an audience of Abdul Medjid. The Sultan, in order to avoid communication with Prince Menschikoff, at once referred him to his ministers, of whom a change had then taken place, Redschid Pacha being the new minister for foreign affairs.

A council of all the great dignitaries of the empire being

convened to deliberate on the acceptance or the rejection of the Russian note, they rejected the proposals of the Russian ambassador. In the meantime the Russian ambassador at the Court of St. James, gave the British government the most explicit assurances of his Court, that "the Emperor's desire and determination was, to respect the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and that all the idle rumours to which the arrival of Prince Menschikoff in the Ottoman capital had given rise—the occupation of the Principalities—hostile and threatening language to the Porte, &c., were not only exaggerated, *but destitute even of any* sort *of foundation;* and lastly, that the mission never had, and had not even then any object, but that which had been communicated to the British government."

On the 9th of May, the British government were informed by their ambassador at Constantinople, that "the affair of the holy places had been definitively settled to the satisfaction of the French and Russian embassies on the 25th of April."

This statement was made on false representations of the Russian minister at the Porte.

Prince Menschikoff's departure from Constantinople was then on the eve of taking place.

The 18th of May was the day accorded by Prince Menschikoff to the Turks, to give their final answer to the ultimatum of Russia, that was virtually to determine which of the two sovereigns was to govern several millions of members of the Greek church in the Ottoman dominions—the Sultan or the Czar. The Divan, by a large majority, decided on refusal of the Russian demand, and their determination was conveyed in a note to the Russian ambassador. Prince Menschikoff, on receiving the answer, at once sent in his final note, declaring that his mission was at an end, and that nothing remained for him but to take his departure, with the whole of the embassy. On the 21st of May, Prince Menschikoff left Constantinople.

The 15th of May, the Sultan, in Divan, made a communication to his ministers and councillors. He said: "He had

done all in his power to preserve terms of amity and peace with the Emperor of Russia, and every reasonable request of his had been complied with. But now he had made a demand which could not be acceded to without compromising the rights of his sovereignty and the prerogatives of his crown. And if it pleased God to inflict the scourge of war on his nation and the Czar's, the responsibility rested not with him. Conscious that he was guiltless of any provocation that had led to this war, he would, at the risk of his life, in person defend the holy cause of Islam, and the territory of the Ottoman Empire."

On the 31st of May, Count Nesselrode addressed a letter to Redschid Pacha, re-urging the former demands of his master, and stating that, if again rejected, in a few weeks the Russian troops would have orders to cross the Ottoman frontiers—not to make war, but to obtain a material guarantee, as a security for the rights claimed by the Emperor. Redschid Pacha, in reply, announced the promulgation of a hatti sheriffe, confirming the rights and privileges which the clergy and the church of the Greek faith had heretofore enjoyed.

In the meantime, the four great powers—England, France, Austria, and Prussia—represented at a conference in Vienna, had adopted certain terms to be offered to Russia, and conceded by the Porte, respecting the protectorate, which terms were accepted by the Czar. But the Porte declined to accede to them without a modification of certain words, and the Czar, in return, refused to consent to that modification.

The representatives of the four great powers at the conference of Vienna, committed a signal blunder in not consulting with the Ottoman ambassador at that court on so important a subject, respecting his own government.

The Turkish government had objected to the terms of the second paragraph of the Vienna note,—"the active solicitude shown at all times by the Emperor of Russia for the maintenance of the immunities and privileges of the orthodox Greek church in the Ottoman Empire," and proposed these words should be changed into the following—"the Sultans have

never ceased to watch over the maintenance of that church in the Ottoman Empire."

On the receipt of the Czar's refusal of the modified terms, the Western Powers felt that they could not press it on the acceptance of the Porte, admitted (as it was) that the Note was a political blunder, and, moreover, capable ot different interpretations from what the Four Powers intended.

At this juncture the war party in Constantinople became outrageously violent. The fanaticism of the religious portion of the population was more than red hot; the temperature of its phrenzied zeal was up to white heat. The government seemed to have no control over this turbulent people. One of the frequent panics of a Turkish populace had taken place, but the perturbation was not confined to the rabble or the theologians. The Sultan is said to have shared in it. An insurrection was momentarily expected; some Turcoman hordes had poured into Constantinople, proffering their unwelcome aid against the infidels, in defence of the law of Islam.

Tumultuous assemblages of the people took place in the vicinity of the principal mosques and the palaces of the chief functionaries of state, clamouring against the infidels, and crying out "War or Death."

Lord Stratford de Redcliffe communicated to his government, on the 2nd of October, that the Turks had resolved on declaring war, contrary to his advice and to that of the ministers of the Sultan, but that *it was adopted under the immediate influence of the Mufti and the Ulemas.*

For the events that took place in Constantinople after the departure of the Prince Menschikoff, and the renewed efforts of the Allied Powers to prevent hostility between Russia and Turkey, I am indebted mainly to Mr. Fowler's "History of the War with Russia," published in 1855, Mr. Joyce's "The Cossack and the Turk," 1854, and Professor Creasy's work on "Turkish History."

The Turkish government, about the middle of June, began to take into their serious consideration the amelioration of

the condition of their Christian subjects, so strenuously enforced upon them by the British ambassador, when a general council was held to deliberate on the measures to be taken in their favour; the sitting lasted until two hours after sunset, and the unanimous decision was to accord to all the subjects of the Porte, who were not Mussulmans, firmans confirming their religious rights. It was specifically declared that "whoever in any way impedes the execution of these firmans, that he shall be severely punished." The next day the Greek, Armenian, and Catholic Patriarchs, with the grand Rabbis, were summoned to the Sublime Porte, and each of them received a firman confirming all the concessions made to the different religious sects since the occupation of Constantinople by the Turks, granting them full and complete toleration, as a proof of the goodwill, moderation, and desire of the Sultan to conciliate all his faithful subjects.

These firmans, guaranteeing their religious and civil rights and immunities, were read on the 12th of June in each of the Patriarchates at Constantinople, and in the synagogue, in the presence of their principal members; they were well received, and a unanimous resolution was come to, to present an address to the Sultan, thanking him for his paternal protection of the Christians and Israelites, his subjects.

Large bodies of Russian troops were now concentrated on the Pruth, more than 100,000 men, of which one-third was cavalry, and attended with an immense park of artillery.

The first corps, under General Luders, passed the Pruth at Levad on the 21st June, and another detachment passed at Skoaliani; the whole army of occupation, consisting of nearly 120,000 men, completed their entry into the Principalities on the 28th of June, under the chief command of Prince Michael Gortschakoff.

When the intelligence was received at Constantinople of the passage of the Pruth by the Russians, it created great sensation amongst the council of ministers, which was divided into the war and peace parties—the one in favour of strong resist-

ance, the other having confidence in negociations and in the support of the cabinets of Europe. Amongst the Russians in the Principalities everything indicated their intended permanent occupation of them. Prince Michael Gortschakoff, the Commander-in-Chief, issued a proclamation to the inhabitants, to explain the object of the occupation, and directing the maintenance of the actual administration.

The Ottoman capital became exceedingly excited when it was known that the Russians had occupied the Principalities, and a most formidable conspiracy was detected against the life of the Sultan, on the 4th of July; this was only known when fifteen Imaums, or Softas (Mohammedan students), were seen passing through Galata with their hands tied behind them. This unprecedented sight gave rise to a mixed feeling of dread and curiosity, since these Softas are looked up to by good Mussulmans with great awe and respect, as the expounders of the sacred laws of the Koran. The cause of their arrest was a conspiracy to depose the reigning Sultan, in favour of his fanatic brother Abdul Aziz. A few hours after their arrest, they were put to death by the bowstring.

On the 14th of July, the Turkish government addressed a protest to the Russian Cabinet, against the occupation of the Principalities by the Russian troops.

Religious fanaticism had not risen so high for centuries at Constantinople; the excitenent of the population there against Russia was at its height, and the government made immense preparations for the coming conflict with the Emperor.

The Allied Powers now seriously occupied themselves to endeavour by negotiation to prevent hostilities between Russia and the Porte, the former power having delared that her occupation of the Danubian Principalities was not intended as a declaration of war.

The French government had, on the 27th of June, proposed the plan of settlement, on which was ultimately based the celebrated "Vienna Note," and on the 24th of July the representatives of the four great powers—France, Austria, Great

Britain, and Russia—met at Vienna, under the presidency of M. de Buol, to discuss the new propositions, which were to be submitted to the Emperor Nicholas and to the Sultan. A few days after these representatives agreed to the terms, which the telegraph transmitted to Paris and London. They were returned to Vienna by the same agency, with the assent of France and England, and on the 26th of July they were transmitted to St. Petersburgh by the telegraph, which immediately brought back the adhesion of the Emperor Nicholas to the note, and it was officially stated to the British ambassador at St. Petersburgh "that the Emperor would accept the terms recommended to him by the Conference of Vienna, if the Porte would accept the note such as it stands (*sans variation*), and that His Majesty would then receive the Ottoman ambassador." The most important paragraph of the note was as follows:—"The undersigned have received orders to declare by the present note that the government of His Majesty the Sultan will remain faithful to the letter and spirit of the treaties of Kiarnardji and Adrianople relative to the protection of the Christian religion, and that His Majesty considers himself bound in honour to observe for ever, and to preserve from all prejudice, either now or hereafter, the enjoyment of the spiritual privileges which have been granted to his Imperial Majesty's august ancestors, and to the orthodox Eastern church, which are maintained and confirmed by him; and, moreover, in a spirit of exalted equity, to cause the Greek rites to share in the advantages granted to the other Christian rites by convention or special agreement."

The promptitude with which this proposal was accepted by the Emperor Nicholas, in withdrawing his arrogant pretences within the limits of this note, deserves attention. Its contents were known at St. Petersburgh on the 29th of July, and within twenty-four hours it was accepted, but it did not reach Constantinople until the 9th of August, nor until the 18th of that month did the council of Ministers deliberate upon it at all, when the grand Council of the Divan was assembled,

and they at length unanimously agreed to advise the Sultan to accept the note, *provided certain alterations were introduced in the form of it.*

The conditions proposed to the Ottoman Porte by Russia, on the draft at a convention, deserve attention. The first article stipulated that "the Greek religion should be always protected in all the churches, and that Russia should have the right, as in times past, to *give orders* to the churches, both in Constantinople and other places and towns, *as well as to the ecclesiastics.*" The second article secured to Russia the right of watching over the election to the four great patriarchates of the East, and expressly included "the *temporal advantages*, as well as the more spiritual privileges, which they had enjoyed as matters of engagement towards the Emperor of Russia."

The third article went into still greater detail in regulating, on the same principle, "the relations between the Porte and these great depositaries of ecclesiastical and political influence and power." The Porte argued very naturally that the Sultan had not violated any existing treaties, and that there was no pretence for the charge that she had sought to evade them. The treaty of Kianardji has merely the following clause relative to the Christian subjects of the Porte: "The Sublime Porte promises constantly to protect the Christian religion and its churches." Since no breach of this treaty could be proved, the Ottoman Porte rejected the proposed "Sened," or convention, of Prince Menschikoff, and his subsequent note of the 5th of May, being in *substance* similar to the first, was likewise rejected. The Russian ambassador tried again another note, already alluded to, the principal clause of which was worded thus: "The orthodox religion of the East, its clergy, its churches, and its possessions, as well as the religious establishments, shall enjoy for the future, without any detriment, under the protection of his Majesty the Sultan, the privileges and immunities which are secured them *ab antiquo*, or which have been granted them at various times by the imperial favour, and, on a principle of high equity, shall participate in

the advantages accorded to the other Christian sects, as well as to the foreign legates accredited to the Sublime Porte, by convention or special arrangement." The same objections, however, to the substance of this note remained, the words "*ab antiquo*" being construed to imply a determination to include ancient and dangerous jurisdictions. On the 30th of May, 1853, the Emperor declared that he would occupy the Principalities, if, within eight days, the Menschikoff ultimatum was not accepted by the Porte, and on the 15th of June the allied fleets of England and France anchored in Besika Bay. It is important to notice that, from the date of the order of the fleets to repair to Besika Bay to that of the declaration of war against Russia by the Porte, was an interval of *five months*. This last event did not take place till the end of September.

The Western Powers then decided to send the allied fleets to Constantinople if the Porte should require their presence, whether the war was declared or not; and it was not until the 22nd of November that the Austrian and Prussian governments agreed with the Western Powers in the proposed course of adjustment between the Porte and Russia. A collective note was signed by the four Powers to the following effect: "The existence of Turkey in the limits assigned to her by treaty, is one of the necessary conditions of the balance of power in Europe, and the undersigned plenipotentiaries record with satisfaction that the existing war cannot in any case lead to modifications in the territorial boundaries of the two empires, which might be calculated to alter the state of possession in the East, which has been established for a length of time, and which is equally necessary for the tranquillity of all the other Powers."

The great diplomatists at Vienna were again busily occupied with the modifications of the Note, if possible, to make them acceptable to both parties. The clause in dispute was the following: "That the Sultan would cause the Greek Christians to participate equally in the advantages granted, or hereafter

to be granted, to other Christians by conventions or special ordinances." The modification of the Porte was as follows: "That the Sultan would make the Greek Christians participate equitably in the advantages granted to other Christian communities, being *Ottoman subjects.*" The purport of this limitation will be explained by observing, that certain Christian congregations exist within the Turkish dominions which are, nevertheless, not immediately subject to the Porte. In more than one place, the followers of the Latin church have obtained privileges by which, in virtue of ancient compacts, they are removed from the sphere of Turkish jurisdiction, and are subject only to superiors of their own. It is said that the terms of the unmodified note would have consigned to Russia something like a practical jurisdiction over three-fourths of the population of European Turkey, to the prejudice of the Ottoman government. This result the Sultan was not prepared to accept.

In Constantinople the government from May, 1853, was menaced with insurrection by large bodies of exasperated people, or rather infuriated fanatics, demanding war, and denouncing ministers who were supposed inclined to peace, and calling for war against the Russians, without waiting for the support of England and France, who, they said, had clearly proved that Turkey could not depend upon them.

On the 10th of September, a body of about forty Softas, students of the Koran, presented themselves before the Council then assembled, and claimed an audience. On being admitted into the Council chamber, they presented a petition, signed by numerous Ulemas and Softas, praying for war. The petition was principally composed of quotations from the Koran, enjoining war on the enemies of Islam, and it contained threats of a disturbance if not complied with. Some of the ministers endeavoured to reason with those who presented it. The only answer they obtained was, "Here are the words of the Koran; if you are Mussulmans, you are bound to obey. You are now listening to foreign and infidel ambassadors, who are the

enemies of the faith. We are children of the prophet. We have an army, and that army cries out with us for war, to avenge the insults which the giaours have heaped upon us."—When they retired, they perambulated the streets, and these addresses and placards had produced such an effect upon the lower orders, that it was doubtful at what point the popular effervescence would stop. The Ottoman Government became alarmed, and applied to the ambassadors of England and France to order some steamships to pass the Dardanelles; and, on their own responsibility, they ordered three French, and three English frigates to ascend the Sea of Marmora, and to moor at the entrance of the Bosphorus, to protect the property of the Christian population of the city: which shows the importance that the affairs of the East had then assumed. This is the first time that any ship of war had passed the Straits since they were closed by the Convention of 1841 against the armed forces of all the Powers. On the 4th October, the combined fleets entered the Straits of the Dardanelles.

On the 27th of September previously, the Sultan had signed the declaration of war against Russia, contrary to the advice of the British minister, and some of his own advisers, being driven to that step by the furious fanaticism of his subjects.

A manifesto of the Turkish Government was promulgated on the 3rd of October, remarkable for its truth and perspicuity in the exposition of the causes of the rupture with Russia. The dispute about the "Holy Places," had been declared by Prince Menschikoff himself to have been "satisfactorily settled." It then proceeded to show that the demands of the Czar which occasioned the present difficulties, were in no degree connected with the competition of Greeks and Latins respecting the holy shrines—they had reference exclusively to the dependence of the Greek Christians upon himself as head of the Greek Church, not only to the prejudice of the Sultan, but of the Patriarch of Constantinople. They included (as both Turkey and Europe discerned) not a mere desire of precedence of Greeks over Latins, but a deliberate intention of transferring to St. Petersburgh the

allegiance owned by four-fifths of the Sultan's subjects in Europe.

Orders were sent to Omar Pacha to commence hostilities, should not the Danubian provinces be evacuated by the Russian troops within fifteen days, accompanied by a large sum of money for the troops. The ultimatum presented by Omar Pacha to Prince Gortchakoff, was to the following effect: "All the strong places in the Principalities to be given into the hands of the Turks, their complete evacuation as speedily as possible, and a guarantee of all the Powers against a similar invasion."

Although a vast deal of military ardour had been excited throughout the Ottoman dominions on the present occasion, it should be observed, that the conscription which applied to Mussulmans only, although but for five years, was so abhorrent to many of them, that it had been the cause of the ruin of numerous villages—the male population fleeing to avoid the military service. Hence cultivated plains had been turned into deserts, which we learn from their history had indirectly checked the increase of the Mahommedan population. The Christians have never been allowed to serve in the army, and only to a limited degree, among the Greeks, have they served in the navy. The irregular cavalry, or the "Spahis," as they were called, who were formerly compelled to serve the Sultan in war, formed a body guard of daring warriors, who penetrated the heart of Europe. These are now replaced by a few miserable companies of "Bashi Bazouks," who have greatly deteriorated from the Spahis; the men being generally so ill-armed and badly mounted as to be unfit for regular service. These Bashi Bazouks, who have left their homes in Asia and Syria, are a class much in common with the Janissaries, whom Mahmoud destroyed. They are equally restless, turbulent, and impatient of discipline; and, like the members of that fallen corps, are a bad specimen of the soldier and the citizen. They are still Janissaries in spirit, and mode of warfare. They are nearly all of them petty tradesmen in the decaying towns of

Asia, and owners of little spots of land which yield a wretched subsistence, and are glad to leave their native parts in search of excitement, and of probable plunder; they mount their horses, seize their firearms, and ride five hundred miles to be enrolled in the army of the Danube.

The enthusiasm of the population of Constantinople, was still more strongly excited by the publication of a manifesto by the Sultan on the 31st October, in a national assembly, presided over by his Highness himself, when he announced that it was his intention to buckle on the sword, to proceed to Adrianople, and march at the head of his troops. It was likewise stated that the Sublime Porte would agree to negociate with the Russians only on the following terms: "All the strong places in the Principalities to be given into the hands of the Turks; complete evacuation of the Principalities in the shortest time; the guarantee of all the Powers against a similar invasion."

It is said that the Turkish clergy offered to place 200,000,000 piastres at the disposal of the Sultan. After the declaration of war, the representatives of the Allied Powers paid visits to the Sultan, who desired them to assure their respective sovereigns that his wish was to settle his differences with the government of Russia amicably; but he added his ancestors had captured Constantinople sword in hand, and that if fate ordained it should fall to another master, the Turks would quit the country sword in hand, or die as soldiers to their national faith.

The Porte now sought by every means to conciliate their Christian subjects; the Greek Patriarch was invited to attend the sitting of the Privy Council, so great an honour never having been accorded to a Greek prelate before, nor indeed to a dignitary of any Christian church in the Ottoman dominions. The political power exercised by the Greek prelates was liable to great abuse; but the Porte, since the publication of the celebrated "Hatti Scheriffe of Gulhane," has endeavoured gradually to restrict it; the power of the bishops is

curtailed, and they can no longer punish those who may abandon their faith. The sentence of excommunication was more easily put into execution in the Greek church than any other, and its victims were reduced to utter ruin. The Greeks of the Ottoman Empire are composed of two great races—"Greeks proper and Sclavonians"—between whom there is perhaps as little affection as between Greeks and Turks. A part of the Sclavonians (the Servians) are already all but independent, hating, as they do, both Turkish and Russian interference; the others are a small population of rude, uncivilized hordes, avowedly devoted to Russia; while the Bulgarians, who, in all Russian invasions of Turkey, have by far the greater burden of the war to support, detest equally both Turks and Muscovites. As for the Greeks proper, it is notorious that they look upon the Turks with the same feelings to-day that their ancestors regarded them four centuries ago, and only wait the opportunity to place the cross once more on the dome of St. Sophia. Of the Greek population it is extremely difficult even to approximate their numbers, since the Turkish government has no distinct information on the subject. The Mussulmans in Europe are estimated at less than a fourth of the Christians, whilst the Christians of Asia amount to scarcely a fourth of the Mohammedans.

The Emperor Nicholas published a formal declaration of war against Turkey, the 11th November, 1853.

The attack of a Russian squadron on the fort and Turkish shipping of Sinope, situated on the coast of Anatolia, on the southern shore of the Black Sea, was attended with disastrous results to the small naval force of the Turks.

The supineness of the Turks on this occasion was inexcusable. On the 23rd of November three Russian ships of the line cruised during four days in sight of Sinope, and on the 29th a reinforcement of three three-deckers, two other ships of the line, two frigates and four steamers, joined them; on the following day, at noon, the Russian commander summoned the Turks to surrender, which

Osman Pacha, the commodore in command, refusing to do, the Russians poured in a most destructive fire. The Turks, having at length cut their cables, and let their ships drift on shore, the strand batteries opened their fire; at this fearful moment, the roaring of artillery, continual explosions, fragments of wrecks and human bodies which were hurled about in all directions, presented one of the most fearful spectacles ever beheld; the Russian ships fired such tremendous broadsides that the decks of some of the Turkish vessels were literally carried overboard. The Turkish fleet consisted of seven frigates, having on board 344 guns, and 3,480 men; three sloops, with 70 guns, and 734 men; two steamers, with 20 guns, and 450 men. Of these there were destroyed in a few hours, by the enemy's fire, three frigates, two sloops, and one steamer, one frigate was cast ashore, four captains of frigates were killed, the commodore, Osman Pasha, the captain of one of the frigates, and one of the commanders of the sloops were taken prisoners, the captains of two frigates and one steamer missing. The survivors of the massacre, about 1,000 men, had been on land at Sinope; 120 were made prisoners by the Russians: about 3,000 were slaughtered.

The arrival of the combined English and French fleets in the Bosphorus on the 15th of November, was hailed by the Turks with great enthusiasm. They consisted of 44 sail, including line of battle ships, frigates, and steamers, in addition to which there were seven line of battle ships, Turkish and Egyptian, besides steamers. The Sultan took the opportunity of acknowledging his obligations to Great Britain on the occasion of the British Ambassador presenting to him the admiral and officers of the British fleet, whose arrival in the Bosphorus was a striking proof of the friendship of Great Britain.

The English Government, through its minister at the Porte, still used every possible exertion to restore peace. The representatives of England, France, Austria, and Prussia, signed a new convention for that object, and setting forth their united views as to the maintenance of the territorial limits of the Ottoman

Empire, and the sovereignty of the Porte. The second Vienna note of the 5th of December, 1853, was presented to the Divan by the four ambassadors, on the 15th of December, proposing renewed negociations, based: 1st, On the evacuation of the Principalities as promptly as possible. 2nd, On the renewal of the treaties. 3rd, On the communication of the firman relative to the spiritual advantages granted by the Sublime Porte to all its non-Mussulman subjects; a communication which, when made to the Powers, should be accompanied by suitable guarantees given to each of them; the arrangements already made to complete the accord relative to the holy places, and to the religious establishments at Jerusalem, to be definitively adopted. And the Sublime Porte on its side shall declare its firm resolution to more effectually develop by its administrative system, the internal ameliorations which may satisfy the wants and the just expectations of its subjects of all classes."

The Sultan, weighing the heavy responsibility he should assume in the presence of his people, by a resolution which should not have obtained the sanction of the ministry, required the delay of forty-eight hours, that he might have time to convene the great National Council. This Council was convened, composed of the existing and of the late ministers, likewise of the principal Ulemas, of the professors of the chief mosques, of the high functionaries in active service, of those who had retired, and, finally, of the generals and colonels then present at Constantinople. The deliberations of this assembly were extremely animated; they lasted two days, and ended with the adoption of the following resolution:—"The Porte will accept the collective Note of the Four Powers; it will nominate a plenipotentiary to treat for peace, in any town except Vienna; it will accept the declaration of the Four Powers, that the evacuation of the Principalities shall be considered as a conclusive *sine quâ non* of the negociations; and that the war shall not change the territorial condition of Turkey. The Porte declares, at the same time, that it will not renew the treaties which existed before the war between it and Russia." The latter

part of this resolution led to long conferences between the ambassador andRedschid Pacha; this minister declared that the Divan would not on any account, maintain the treaties of Adrianople and Kiarnardji.

The Ulemas, Dervishes, and theological students of Constantinople, on the renewal of the efforts for peace by the European Allied Powers, became more turbulent than ever. They not only assembled riotously, but they adopted a practice never before had recourse to in Turkey; they drew up a memorial for presentation to the government, declaring the holy religion of Islam was in danger, that the sacred book of the law, and its injunctions to make war on the infidels who were in arms against them, had been despised by the friends of the giaours in the Councils of the Sultan, and the advocates of peace with the Russians. The friend of the giaours and advocate of the peace policy glanced at in the manifesto of the fanatics of Stamboul, was Redschid Pacha, the principal minister of state. On the night of the 21st the Softa rioters, as these theological firebrands were called, rushed *en masse* to the residence of the chief of religion, whose office it is to give decisions on the application of the Koran to important passing events and questions of moment—the Effendi Mufti—and behaved in an outrageous manner, yelling for war against the infidels. The terrified functionary escaped from his abode; and the following morning, in a still more outrageous manner, the Softas assembled in the public streets, and congregated in great numbers round all the principal mosques, screaming for war, and denouncing the enemies of the law of Islam, at home and abroad.

An insurrection being now imminent, the Divan thought the time was come to repress the tumult that threatened the lives of all the ministers and public functionaries. The commander of the garrison of Constantinople made his appearance before the great mosque of the Sultan Achmet, with two battalions of infantry, and called on the Softas to disperse, on pain of dying the death of rebels.

No sooner was the warning given, and the soldiers posted with evident preparation to give effect to it, than the riotous multitude of fanatics, young and old, thus forcibly reminded of the fate of the Janissaries, deemed it was the will of heaven that they should disperse. But, from all accounts of the proceedings of the Turkish government and the Sultan, the efforts of the European Allied Powers for peace were frustrated, and the wishes of the Sultan and his principal ministers defeated, by the fanaticism of the religious party of the capital—the Ulemas, Dervishes, teachers and students of theology, and their adherents.

On the following day, the 21st of December, 1853, multitudes of the fanatical rioters still assembled round the mosques, and small parties of military from time to time appeared, and made arrests of ringleaders who were prominently violent. The Sultan, evidently in alarm, at this juncture issued a proclamation, declaring that he had not concluded any treaty of peace, that the Allied Powers were resolved to uphold the Ottoman Empire, and that any parties who impugned acts of government and Imperial Edicts, unanimously approved by the Council of State, and having the sanction of the Sacred Felva—given by the head of the Divine Law (the Mufti)—should incur a grievous penalty.

The Softas formed fresh meetings in the vicinity of the mosque of Sultan Baized, which is close to the official residence of the Seraskier. Osman Pacha presented himself with a column of the line to the rioters, and riding out in front of his men, whom he ordered to halt, exhorted the Softas to refrain from such assemblages; at the same time, he informed them, that if they had any communication to make to the magistrates, they were free to do so, but in becoming order and in small numbers.

The ringleaders only followed half his advice: many of them entered the War Office, and it is stated that their language was so strong that there was nothing left for it but to arrest them; they were so arrested, and their comrades, in consider-

able numbers outside, retired at once. During the night of the 23rd, several of the most violent were arrested, in all about a hundred. The prisoners, after undergoing examination, were sentenced to exile in the island of Candia, and were embarked the same night in the steam frigate, which after landing them, was to proceed to Alexandria to take in troops.

In Asia the Russians had been uniformly successful against the Turks, chiefly arising from the incapacity of the Turkish commanders, and from jealousies and dissensions among themselves.

Much alarm prevailed at Constantinople and at Galata on the 21st of December; the excitement was increased by the reports that an inglorious peace was about to be concluded with the Russians. At noon, the Mussulman hour of prayer, numbers of the Ulemas and Softas assembled in the mosques, inflammatory passages from the Koran were read, and violent reproaches were levelled against the ministry. The mosques were crowded, and remained so long after the customary hours of prayer were over; the people perambulated the streets and the bazaars, giving expression either to their own resentment or repeating the instructions of their employers. At one period of the day the government were seriously apprehensive of an outbreak. Precautions were quietly taken, and the artillery were ordered to hold themselve in readiness. Information of the danger was communicated to Lord Redcliffe, and under his orders a gentleman from the embassy immediately left for the fleet, taking with him a request from the Ambassador to the Admiral to send the steamers to the mouth of the Golden Horn for the protection of the British residents in the capital. They were accordingly despatched, under the command of the Hon. Captain Drummond, of the "Retribution," and were stationed, together with some French steamers, at the place indicated; and the following day the boats of the squadron patrolled the Golden Horn.

There is one thing very noticeable in these fanatical out-

breaks of the religious war party of the theologial class; that their animosity against the Russians was apparently not in the smallest degree stronger or more sincerely rancorous than it was against the other Giaours of England and France, who were then in alliance with the Sultan. This was so manifest that in the latter part of December, 1853, Lord Redcliffe, the British Ambassador at the Porte, felt so uneasy about the security of British subjects, that he addressed a note to the Porte, expressing a hope the Divan would, without delay, adopt any measures that might be deemed necessary for the security of the European residents at Constantinople.

In Russia the fanaticism of the war party was hardly less vehement than in Turkey. "The orthodox faith," and "the holy Synod," and "the church of the true believers," were all kept in a state of phrenzied excitement by perpetual appeals to the piety and the fears of the faithful, for their religion, at the hands of the mortal enemies allied against it—Turks, Catholics, and Protestants.

In the provinces, too, of the Turkish empire, religious excitement was not quite dormant among the Rayah population of all christian creeds at the close of 1853. Movements in various quarters began to take place, not only for the upholding of spiritual, but asserting national rights of all Christians living under Mahommedan rule.

Considerable funds had been raised by the wealthy Greeks in different parts of the world, and the intended insurrection was concerted and prepared by men of great ability and energy, who were resolved to devote themselves to the national cause. It was reported that this disaffection was the result of Russian intrigue, as a mode of carrying confusion into the heart of the Ottoman empire; but the causes of disaffection among the Christian inhabitants of the Ottoman Porte are not chiefly of Russian growth. From generation to generation the Christians have lived under the tyrannical rule of a brutal, fanatical race, holding by the sword a vast and once civilized territory; a race

intolerant in its creed, and alike regardless of the feelings and the welfare of the rayah population of Turkey, who were, in the literal sense of the word, *enslaved.*

A vast conspiracy was discovered at Constantinople early in January, with the object of raising an insurrection amongst the Greek population on the banks of the Danube, and it was supposed that many eminent persons at the Court of Athens were implicated in it. In Albania the Greek insurrection rapidly increased, where bands of armed men went from village to village, urging the inhabitants to rise; arms and ammunition were distributed amongst them, and the Turks were everywhere put to flight; inflammatory proclamations were distributed in great numbers. On the 8th February a revolutionary movement occurred at Salonica, when the Turkish troops attacked the insurgents at the point of the bayonet, and they were soon dispersed; but in Epirus and Thessaly they were more successful; here their forces amounted to 3,000 men, partly consisting of Greek deserters. To carry on this war of independence, it is added that they were receiving assistance from the government of Greece.

On the 28th February, the Governments of England and France resolved to address to the Emperor of Russia a formal summons, calling upon him to give, in six days, a solemn promise that he will cause his troops to evacuate the Principalities of the Danube on or before the 30th April. It does not appear that this principle of policy was adopted by the Allied Powers, in consequence of any treaty binding them to the maintenance of the Ottoman empire, since the treaty of 1841, to which Russia was a party, *does not thus bind the European powers.*

The insurrectionary movement in Epirus began to spread rapidly at the close of 1853. A proclamation was issued by the insurgents, stating that " the inhabitants, primates, and elders of Baconica, in the province of Arta, sighing under the pressure of the exorbitant taxation which had been imposed on them by Turkish rulers, who were not only incapable of civilization, but

in their barbarity violated the chastity of their maidens, do renew the struggle of 1821, and swear, by the name of the Almighty, and by their sacred fatherland, in no case, and under no plea, to lay down their arms until they had obtained their liberty.

"At the commencement of this struggle, they hoped to move the sympathy of their brethren of the free Greeks, and of those groaning under the Ottoman yoke, so that they may take up arms to renew the holy war of 1821, and fight for their fatherland, and for their inalienable rights. The war was holy and just, and no one who considered the weight of their burden, and the right of nations, would utter a word in defence of their barbarous oppressors, or advocate the cause of the crescent, which is planted on the summit of their sacred church. Up, then, brethren! rush to battle, throw off this hated yoke of tyrants, and loudly proclaim to God and the world that they do battle for their fatherland, and that the Most High is our shield of defence." (with twelve signatures.)

The following oath was taken by all those enlisted in the cause:—"I swear by the holy gospels, by the holy Trinity, and by Him crucified, that I take up arms which shall not be laid down until our oppressors are driven from the houses of my fathers, and my fatherland is free. I also swear by an Almighty God to be faithful to my flag, and, if necessary, to shed the last drop of my blood in defence of my comrades."

The Greek insurrection was now becoming very formidable, and consequently embarrassing to the Ottoman government. Arta had been taken on the 8th of February, by a band of insurgents under a celebrated leader Karaeskures. Prevesa was threatened; the Suliotes had once more raised the standard of the cross, the Christian forces were advancing on Janine and Servia, and Montenegro threatened to join them. The government of king Otho was entirely without the means of resisting the excitement, and even the schools of Athens were closed to prevent the students rushing to the chiefs. It was not thought that the Greeks were at this time in a condition to resuscitate

the empire of the East, but the Russians were expecting a general insurrection of the Christian population throughout the Turkish Empire, and great successes attended the insurgents, who were everywhere receiving reinforcements. The garrison of Platina capitulated, and Peta surrendered without attempting to resist, when the Greeks set fire to the Turkish barracks, and invested the seaport of Prevesa. These conflicts were likely to revive the ancient and fierce animosity of the Turks and Christians, and to place the Greeks themselves in a false position with the Christian Powers. Independence was justly regarded by them as a natural cause, quite irrespective of the Russian aggressions on Turkey, and was rendered formidable by the national character which it assumed, and by the oppressions to which they had been long subjected. The rural population, oppressed by fiscal exactions, and subjected to intolerable acts of violence and injustice, could not be expected to retain any but the most rancorous feeling towards their persecutors. A war of races and religions conducted by irregular troops against a warlike and exasperated people, must give rise to the most deplorable scenes which can be imagined. Four provinces in Lower Epirus had already risen—the districts of Sconlicara, Rudoritzi, Zoumorka, and Agrapha, where more than 2,000 men were under arms; their flag, bearing the Greek cross on a blue ground, with the motto *Labarum:* the ancient standard of Byzantium, "Conquer by this." In their proclamation they said that, "Being no longer able to bear the barbarism which oppresses them—the violation of all law, the pillage of their property, the dishonour of their daughters—they have taken arms to re-conquer their liberty, and to continue the work of 1821, which for them has only been interrupted." They then took an oath to die to the last man, rather than submit themselves again to the Turks.

Several engagements on a small scale took place, and in all the Turks were beaten. Arta was taken and Prevesa capitulated. The insurrection extended to the country of the formid-

able Souliotes. From the Ionian Islands large numbers of Greeks passed over to Epirus to join their countrymen.

The doctrines which Lord John Russell enunciated and acted on in 1860, were, unfortunately for the Greeks, not recognised in 1852 and 1853 by either English or French government. In Epirus, Chistrian patriots, being under Turkish rule—a grinding tyranny, intolerably oppressive—starting up in defence of their trodden-down national and religious rights and privileges, were treated as turbulent, disaffected, seditious subjects of a state well governed, justly, fairly, and mercifully ruled—were denounced as dupes of foreign powers; and all the influence of the French and English in the new kingdom of Greece, and, on the part of England, of direct governmental action in the Ionian Islands, were brought to bear on the Greek patriots of Epirus, and to bring their cause to ruin. So that the Turkish Empire was saved from its domestic enemies, as well as its foreign foe, by the allied Christian sovereigns of France and England.

Besides the Treaty of Alliance between France and England, there were two separate conventions, one relating to a loan made to Turkey in England and France of 20,000,000 francs, and guaranteed by those powers, and in relation also to engagements of those powers not only to defray the subsistence of the auxiliary troops, but all other expenses to be borne by their respective governments; the second convention related to the reform in favour of Christians which had been promised by the Porte.

The latter engagement, on the 12th of April, 1854, was indeed fulfilled on paper, and even that fulfilment endangered the Turkish government and the Sultan. The Sheik-(ul)-Islam, the Pontiff of Mohammedanism, was so alarmed for the faith at the tolerant measure proposed by the government, that he resigned his office, declaring his opinion that the whole fabric of Islamism was endangered by it. The measure was strenuously opposed by the other functionaries of state of the old

Turkish party in the Divan, who were of opinion that it had been better to have yielded to the Russians than to the other giaours who had forced this measure on the government. Redschid Pacha and inexorable fate prevailed over the champions of the faith.

March the 27th, 1853, a royal message was brought down to both Houses of the British Parliament, in which Her Majesty declared: "That she relies with confidence on the exertions of her brave and loyal subjects to support her in her determination to employ the power and resources of the nation for protecting the dominions of the Sultan against the encroachments of Russia;" and in the supplement to the "London Gazette" of Tuesday, March 28th, 1854, war was declared against Russia.

Immediately that war had been declared by the British government against Russia, several contingents of the army were embarked from Southampton for the East.

Of the sacrifice of life and money in this war with Russia, Mr. Fowler, in his "History of the War," published in 1855 (while the contest was still going on), says: "Of 50,000 British troops that have been embarked in this war, the greater part are already *hors de combat.* . . . By an official return made in the 'St. Petersburgh Gazette,' the total losses of the Russian army, in 1854, are given at 111,132 men; taking, therefore at a moderate estimate the losses of the Turks and of the allied armies at very little more than the above amount, we have a total sacrifice to the Moloch of war, in the course of less than two years, of at least a quarter of million of men!

"Such has been the physical expense (says Fowler), to say nothing of the sufferings of the wounded and maimed survivors; but who shall estimate the bill of costs! To England alone it is supposed to amount to a million sterling per week! and very moderate too when every man landed in the Crimea is said to cost the government £100." There is some exaggeration in the latter estimates.

The losses by the French and English in the Crimean Rus-

sian war, as officially acknowledged by both governments, were—

French	62,492
English.	22,450
	84,942

The far greater portion of the above-mentioned losses were occasioned by hardships and privations, by sickness—not by steel, lead, or gunpowder. There are no returns of the losses sustained by the Sardinians and the Turks.

The total Russian loss in this war is estimated by a very competent authority on subjects of this kind, at 200,000. I find by a report of the Russian government, cited in a recent history of Turkey, that the Russian loss in the Danubian Principalities alone, mainly from sickness and effects of sufferings on forced marches, is estimated at 63,000 souls. The Turkish loss in the Crimea and Principalities cannot have been under 50,000; nor that of the Sardinians in the Crimea under six thousand. So that the total loss of life occasioned by this war for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire on the one hand, and the destruction of it on the other, amounted to upwards of 340,000 men.

The expenditure incurred by all the Powers engaged in it must have exceeded two hundred millions sterling. To England alone the cost of preserving the Turkish Empire on this occasion was estimated in parliament at sixty millions sterling, and nearly twenty-three thousand lives!

How many millions more of money, how many thousands more of lives of her own sons, will England have to expend in the next war with Russia, for the maintenance a few years longer of this decrepit empire of the Turks—mortally diseased and grievously disordered and debilitated as it is, in all its organs, functions, and members?

CHAPTER XXII.

Statistics and Finances of the Turkish Empire.

THE dominions of Turkey extend into the three continents of the Old World, over an area of about 30,000 geographical square miles. They border on the Mediterranean, the Adriatic, the Sea of Marmora, the Black Sea, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulph. Their position is not bad for an empire ruled over by a semi-barbarous people. From the best and most recent authorities of an authentic kind, which deal with the statistics of the Turkish Empire, obtained from official sources and diplomatic functionaries in the East—from the writings especially of M. Bouet ("La Turquie D'Europe"), and of M. Ubicini ("Lettres sur la Turquie," etc.: Paris, 1854)—the latter certainly the most complete work on this subject, and the most reliable—the following data are taken. It is not necessary for me to enter extensively into the details in which the latter work particularly abounds; but what little use I do make of his labors I acknowledge most freely, and should feel ashamed if he should have to make the same complaint of me that he has done of the use that has been made of his labors, without stint or scruple, and without acknowledgment, in some recent works that have treated of Turkey and its resources. All my commendation of M. Ubicini's work extends to the statistical information contained in it, but with respect to the author's application of it, and the facts he thinks deducible

from his figures, I neither adopt his views nor think it necessary to controvert them.

The Sclavonians, according to Ubicini, are the most numerous of the races constituting the population of Turkey in Europe, if the Bulgarians be included in the slave element of it. The Sclavonic population in Turkey may be sub-divided thus :—Bulgarians, 3,000,000; Servians of the Principalities, 1,000,000; Servians of Bulgaria and Albania, 500,000; Bosnians and Herzevonians, 1,100,000; Zingari, 400,000, exclusive of four tribes—the Piperi, the Hazes, the Vascovikis, and the Bielopanlikis, of the mountains between Novi Bazar and Montenegro.

The Roumains, or Moldo-Wallachians, scattered throughout the two Principalities and along the right bank of the Danube, are the representatives of the ancient Roman colonists, of the settlements established in Dacia by Trajan.

THE FIVE PRINCIPAL DIVISIONS OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

1.—The Turkish Roum, it must be borne in mind, or Roumelia, is the designation given by the Osmanlis to European Turkey—a name given in the Middle Ages by them to the European territory of the Greeks of the lower empire. It comprehends Thrace, Moldavia, Wallachia, Servia, Bulgaria, Salonica, Epirus, Albania, and Bosnia.

2.—The Turkish name Anatolia is given to a vast region of Asia Minor, that has the Black Sea and the Archipelago, the Mediterranean and the mountain chain of Taurus, for boundaries, and forms a peninsula equal in extent to France.

3.—Turkish Armenia and Kurdistan extends to the frontiers of Persia, and comprehends the governments general (eyealets) of Erzeroum and Karbrout.

4.—The Province of Sham (Syria) extends from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulph, and comprehends five govern-

ments-general, or eyealets—Aleppo (Halep), Saida (Phœnicia and Palestine), Damascus, Mosul (Assyria), and Bagdad (Babylon).

5.—The Province of Arabia (Arabistan) comprehends a portion of Western Arabia and Ethiopia, designated Habesh, Medina and its surrounding very limited territory, the Sherifat of Mecca and Aden.

The islands of the Greek Archipelago are comprised in a separate government general, named Djizar.

The island of Candia, or Crete, is an exception. Taken from the Venetians in 1699, it forms a separate eyealet or general government.

RACES.

THE population of the Turkish Empire in 1853, was composed, according to Ubicini, of fourteen distinct races, but he has strangely omitted one race in his list—the Copts.

The following is the tabular return given by him:—*

RACES.	IN EUROPE.	IN ASIA.	IN AFRICA.	TOTAL.
Ottomans	2,100,000	10,700,000	... ...	12,800,000
Greeks	1,000,000	1,000,000	... ...	2,000,000
Armenians	400,000	2,000,000	... ...	2,400,000
Jews	70,000	80,000	... ...	150,000
Slaves	6,200,000	... ...	... ...	6,200,000
Roumani	4,000,000	... ...	... ...	4,000,000
Albanians	1,500,000	....	... ...	1,500,000
Tartars	16,000	20,000	... ...	36,000
Arabs	... ...	900,000	3,800,000	4,700,000
Syrians & Chaldeans	... ...	235,000	... ...	235,000
Druses	... ...	30,000	... ...	30,000
Kurds	... ...	1,000,000	... ...	1,000,000
Turcomans . . .	... ...	85,000	... ...	85,000
Tsigani	214,000	... ...	... ...	214,000
TOTAL	15,500,000	16,050,000	3,800,000	35,350,000

* "Lettres sur La Turquie," par Mons. Ubicini, 8vo. 1853-4.

RELIGIONS

Of the population of the Turkish Empire, according to Ubicini.

RELIGIONS.	IN EUROPE.	IN ASIA.	IN AFRICA.	TOTAL.
Mussulmans . .	4,550,000	12,650,000	3,800,000	21,000,000
Greeks	10,000,000	3,000,000	... ...	13,000,000
Catholics . . .	640,000	260,000	... ..	900,000
Jews . . . . , .	70,000	80,000	... ...	150,000
Other Sects . .	... ...	... ...	... ...	300,000
TOTAL . . .				35,350,000

In the Rev. H. Christmas's Memior of the Sultan Abdul Medjid Khan, the following statistical table is given :—

The population of the empire amounts to about 35,000,000, including the Danubian Principalities, which, strictly speaking, ought to be excepted, as well as Egypt.

TURKEY IN EUROPE CONTAINS:—		
Thrace	1,800,000	
Bulgaria	3,000,000	
Moldavia	1,400,000	
Wallachia	2,600,000	
Bosnia and Herzogovina . . .	1,100,000	
Roumelia and Thessaly . . .	2,700,000	
Albania	1,200,000	
Servia	1,000,000	
Isles of the Archipelago . . .	700,000	
		15,500,000
TURKEY IN ASIA CONTAINS:—		
Asia Minor	10,000,000	
Syria, Mesopotamia, and Kurdistan .	4,450,000	
Arabia	900,000	
		15,350,000
TURKEY IN AFRICA CONTAINS:—		
Egypt	2,000,000	
Tripoli, Fez, and Tunis . . .	1,800,000	
		3,800,000
Total		34,650,000

Thus the total number, according to the above mentioned estimate, amounts to 34,650,000. But if from these be deducted the Danubian Principalities, Egypt, Tunis, Fez, and Tripoli, where the Sultan is only suzerain, and not reigning sovereign, there will remain a population of 27,200,000, where government is actually administered by the Ottoman monarch. Of these, according to Mr. Christmas, there are :—

	In Europe.	In Asia.	Total.
Osmanlis.....	2,100,000 ...	10,700,000 ...	12,800,000
Greeks	1,000,000 ...	1,000,000 ...	2,000,000
Armenians	400,000 ...	2,000,000 ...	2,400,000
Jews	70,000 ...	80,000 ...	150,000
Sclavonians ...	6,200,000 ...	—— ...	6,200,000
Arabs, in Asia and Africa			4,700,000

The rest are made up of Druses, Kurds, Tartars, Syrians, Turcomans, and Chaldeans. This last computation takes in a large portion of the African Arabs.

Computed with regard to religion, according to the returns of Ubicini, there are in the whole Empire :—

Mahommedans	21,000,000
Christians, Greek and Armenians . .	13,000,000
,, Roman Catholic . . .	900,000
Jews	150,000
Various sects	300,000
	35,350,000

These returns present the very remarkable fact of an empire of 35,350,000 having only 21 millions of its people of the religion of its rulers. The religion of the State is Mohammedan, its sovereign, its laws, and functionaries of all categories, are Turkish. The privileged subjects of this Turkish Empire are Turks—Osmanlis, including Arabs, Kurds, Turcomans, Tartars, a considerable number of slaves—the greater portion of the Arnaouts, Albanians, and some tribes belonging to the Schiite sects, Ishmailians, Metualis, &c.

Upwards of fourteen millions of the people of this Turkish

Empire, are rayahs of different races and religions, all hostile to the religion of their rulers.

The preceding tabular returns M. Ubicini states are "from the general census taken in 1844, throughout the empire, when Riza Pacha, their Minister of War, undertook to reorganize the army, by altering the mode of recruiting." He says, "These returns, if not rigorously exact, are as correct as it was possible to make them." But it must be stated that no means exist in the Turkish Empire, for taking a census of the various races of inhabitants in the provinces, which can be implicitly relied on, or justify us in considering them more than the nearest approximations to the truth which can be arrived at, with such governmental machinery for the collection of data as the administrations of Pachas, Defterdars, Alcadi, and Sheiks, afford for that purpose.

The item of Greek population in the two tables—one of the different races in Turkey, the other of different religions—is very unsatisfactory; in the former we find Greeks set down at two millions. In the latter we find Greeks set down at thirteen millions—ten millions in Europe, and three millions in Asia. The fact is in endeavouring to be compendious with regard to the Christian population, in these tables, the author has made himself unintelligible.

In the table of different races in the Turkish Empire, the Greeks are correctly stated at two millions; the Slaves, though professing the Greek religion, very properly are distinguished in a separate item, and their population is set down at six millions two hundred thousand. The Armenians, too, are distinguished separately, and estimated at two millions four hundred thousand (of which number, seventy thousand are followers of the Eutichean heresy). The Roumani are similarly specified, and estimated at four millions; and the Syrians and Chaldeans at 235,000. Now, if we add all these items together, the total will be 14,000,835. But Ubicini states in the table of different religions, 13,900,000 are Christians, and of these nine hundred thousand are Roman Catholics.

And yet in this tabular return of the different religions of the Turkish Empire, M. Ubicini sets down thirteen millions of this population under the head Greeks; ten millions being in Europe, and three in Asia. The fact is, he has merged the whole Slave, Armenian and Syrian Christian population in this one item, under the head Greeks, instead of Christians of various races of the Greek rite, and has properly introduced in a separate item, Catholics, which he estimates at nine hundred thousand, of which 640,000 are in Europe, and 260,000 in Asia.

So that in reality these official returns are correct. The number of Christians in the Turkish Empire, not in communion with the Church of Rome, is then thirteen millions, and the number of Roman Catholics nine hundred thousand.

From the "Almanach de Gotha," published the year 1860, the following estimate is taken of the numbers belonging to the three principal religions throughout the Turkish Empire, correcting, however, an error, manifestly a mis-print, of one of the items.

[D'apres Kolb.]

	IN EUROPE.	IN ASIA.	IN EGYPT. NUBIA, SENNAAR.	TOTAL.
Mussulmans .	5,450,000	12,550,000	3,000,000	21,000,000
Christians . .	10,640,000	3,260,000	340,000	13,900,000
Jews	70,000	80,000	10,000	160,000
TOTAL . .	15,260,000	15,990,000	3,350,000	35,060,000

In this estimate the populations of the two tributary African provinces of Tripoli and Tunis are not included, which, added together, make 1,700,000, and if to the total of Kolb's estimate of the population of the empire, 35,060,000, we add that of Tripoli and Tunis, 1,700,000, it will be found to amount to 36,760,000, only 160,000 more than the Baron de Reden's.

For the latest statistics of the Turkish Empire, I likewise

refer to "Annuaire Diplomatique et Statistique," so remarkable for the accuracy of its information, the "Almanach de Gotha" for the year 1861.

POPULATION OF THE PROVINCES, AFTER THE BARON DE REDEN'S DATA, OF 1844.

IN EUROPE.

The ancient Thrace	1,800,000
Bulgaria, including Silistria, Widdin, Nissa	3,000,000
Albania, north and south, embracing parts of Epirus, Macedonia, Roumelia, Thessaly: also Scutari, Monastir, &c.	3,900,000
Bosnia (Crotia and Herzègovine Turkish)	1,100,000
Djizair (the Archipelago), and Crete, or Candia (the latter 212,000)	700,000
Moldavia } Tributary Possessions	1,400,000
Wallachia } Tributary Possessions	2,600,000
Servia } Tributary Possessions	1,000,000
Population in Europe	15,500,000

IN ASIA MINOR.

Anatolia (Asia Minor)	10,700,000
Armenia and Kurdistan	1,700,000
Syria (Cham)	2,750,000
Arabistan, Western Arabia, Hedjaz territory, including Mecca and Medina	900,000
Total Population in Asia	16,050,000

IN AFRICA.

Egypt, Nubia or Dongola, Sennaar with Meroe.	3,350,000
Tripoli, with Barka and Fez	750,000
Tunis	950,000
Population in Africa	5,050,000

TOTAL OF POPULATIONS.

In Europe	15,500,000
In Asia	16,050,000
In Africa	5,050,000
Total Population of the Turkish Empire	36,600,000

[This estimate does not differ materially from that of M. Ubicini].

The Almanach de Gotha for 1861, gives also the following divisions of the population of European Turkey, as distributed under the heads Eyalets—the official designation of governmental districts, from returns made in 1845:

	EYALETS.	POPULATION TOTAL.	MUSSULMANS. (IN ROUND NOS.)	CHRISTIANS. (EXACT RETURN.)
TO THE NORTH.	Bosnia	1,850,000	953,976	849,324
	Servia and Belgrade	1,100,000		
	Walachia	1,800,000	4,100,000	4,070,000
	Moldavia	1,200,000		
	Widdin	1,100,000	503,645	596,356
	Silistria	1,200,000	1,018,680	181,320
TO THE SOUTH.	Adrianople	1,459,000	453,732	996,268
	Nissa	1,154,000	477,172	678,828
	Uskup	699,000	356,228	342,772
	Roumelia	1,400,000	647,004	761,996
	Yania	928,000	253,328	674,672
	Salonica	958,000	474,464	118,888
	Crete	212,000	931,112	330,480
	Stamboul	960,000	619,250	
	Archipelago (Islands)	420,000	114,300	305,640
	TOTAL	16,440,000	6,004,921	10,435,079

The same Almanach de Gotha for 1861, gives the following estimate of the population of the whole Turkish Empire for the year 1844:—

Population of European Turkey. . 15,500,000

Population	of Asia Minor, or Anatolia. . .	10,700,000
,,	of Armenia and Kourdistan . .	1,700,000
,,	of Cham, or Syria	2,750,000
,,	of Arabistan, including Mecca, Medina, &c.	900,000
	Total in Asia . . .	16,050,000

POPULATION IN AFRICA.

Population	of Egypt, Nubia, Dongola, Sennaar, Meroè	3,350,000
,,	of Tripoli, Fez, Barka . . .	750,000
,,	of Tunis	950,000
	Total in Africa . .	5,050,000

POPULATION OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

In Europe	15,500,000
In Asia	16,050,000
In Africa	5,050,000
Total . . .	36,600,000

By the return of the population of European Turkey, for 1845—16,440,000—the number of inhabitants exceed that of the previous year, as estimated in the preceding table of the European population for 1844. The difference, I think, is caused by the population of Constantinople—estimated at 960,000—being given in the return for 1845, and not appearing in that for 1844, which is set down at 15,500,000. If to this amount we add the population of Constantinople, the numbers will be 16,460,000.

POPULATION.

Ubicini puts down the total population of the Turkish Empire at 35,350,000, variously estimated by other writers at from seventeen to twenty-two millions.

But in this estimate of Ubicini are included the populations

of Tributary Provinces, over which the Sultan has no direct control—Egypt, Tunis, Wallachia, Moldavia, and Servia—forming a total of 8,200,000 inhabitants.

With this reduction the population of territories immediately subject to the Grand Signior would be 27,150,000.

The population in European Turkey is as follows :—

	Thrace	1,800,000	
	Roumelia and Thrace	2,700,000	
	Bulgaria	3,000,000	
	Albania	1,200,000	
	The Islands	700,000	
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	1,100,000	
			10,500,000
Tributary Subjects.	Wallachia	2,600,000	
	Moldavia	1,400,000	
	Servia	1,000,000	
			5,000,000
			15,500,000*

The population in Asiatic Turkey :—

	Asia Minor	10,700,000	
	Syria, Mesopotamia, and Kurdistan	4,450,000	
	Arabia	900,000	
			16,050,000

The population in Africa :—

Tributary Subjects.	Egypt	2,000,000	
	Tripoli and Fez	600,000	
	Tunis	1,200,000	
			3,800,000

Total gross population of the Turkish Empire 35,350,000

The Turkish ambassador at the Court of Persia, furnished a return, cited by Ubicini, of the population of Turkey in Europe

* M. Boue's estimate of the Population of European Turkey is nearly the same—15,413,000.

and the Islands, classifying the different religions, and thus distributed:—

Mussulmans	5,910,000
Greeks and Armenians	9,650,000
Roman Catholics	650,000
Jews	60,000
Zingari	80,000
Total population in Europe and Islands	16,350,000

McFarlane is certainly greatly mistaken in his estimate of the population of European Turkey.

"The entire population of European Turkey (says McFarlane) falls short of seven millions. The Turks are not numerous, but the Armenians are, and still more so are the Greeks. Out of Constantinople, Adrianople, and Salonica, and a few other large towns, one cannot well use the word *populous* anywhere."*

As far as can be ascertained from Ubicini's conflicting returns, with regard to distinction of races and religion, in the Turkish Empire, it would appear that the Mussulman element in the sum total of its population, exceeds that of the Christian, Jewish, and other unclassed religions, in the proportion of 21,000,000 to 14,350,000. In Europe the proportions are reversed, the European population of Turkey is estimated at 16,350,000, and of those, 5,910,000 are Mussulmans, and 10,440,000 are Christians, Jews, and some unclassed sects.

The Jews we find estimated by Ubicini, at 150,000, of whom 70,000 are in Europe, and 80,000 in Asia. When I was in Jerusalem in 1827, the numbers in that city were estimated at five thousand, and now they are nearly doubled.

The Zingari or gipsies, like their tribe in Europe, have no fixed faith or defined religious tenets; they abound most in Wallachia and Moldavia. Among the unclassed, or those included in the item "other sects," are some small communities

* "Turkey and its Destiny," vol. ii. p. 554.

of Idolators, such as the Chemsizes, and the Yezides of the old Persian worship of fire, numbering about 50,000. It is very doubtful to me if the Ansayri and the Druses ought not to be included in the category of pagans, inclining as they do most decidedly more to idolatory than to any sect of Christians or Mohammedans.

I think Ubicini underrates the Druses, whose numbers he sets down at 30,000.

Population of Constantinople and its suburbs in 1849 and 1850, taken from the Almanack of the Ottoman Empire for the above years, based on returns of general census taken in 1844.

	TRANSITORY SOJOURNERS. SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.	RESIDENTS.		TOTAL, BOTH SEXES.
		MEN.	WOMEN.	
Mussulmans*	68,000	194,000	213,000	475,000
Armenians	16,000	93,000	95,600	205,000
United Armenians . .	... ...	8,420	8,580	17,000
Greeks	32,000	48,000	52,000	132,000
Jews	... ...	18,000	19,000	37,000
	116,000	361,821	388,180	866,000
Subjects not Ottoman .	... ...	... ...	... ...	25,000
Total population of Constantinople . .	... ...	... ...	... ...	891,000

It is to be borne in mind in the population of Constantinople above mentioned, of 891,000, the inhabitants of the numerous villages on both shores of the Bosphorus are included, from the Bosphorus to the Sea of Marmora. Of this population the army and navy constitute 41,000, and a fluctuating class of boatmen, water-carriers, &c., from the provinces, named Bekiars, estimated at 75,000. Deducting the number of the latter, and also of the army and navy, from the above-men-

* In the first item, "Mussulmans," there are included 5,000 male and 42,000 female slaves.

tioned total of the several classes of the population of Constantinople it would remain at 750,000, in the proportion of 361,400 males, to 388,600 females, an argument certainly, if based on sure data, not against the general opinion of the results of polygamy in Turkey, as M. Ubicini supposes, but against the opinion that prevails of the extent to which polygamy is carried. The Spaniards have a term for the designation of a fluctuating population, temporarily sojourning in a city, that expresses the whole meaning of the description of the class of persons above referred to in a single term, "transeuntes," which it would be well to adopt into statistical calculations in all countries. It is in vain to seek in M. Ubicini's tabular returns for any information as to the number of European merchants, agents, and professional men, existing in Constantinople, or the number of Christians in communion with the Church of Rome, or separated from it, residing in Constantinople.

In 1824 I stated that:

"The population of Constantinople had been decreasing for many years;" it then, probably did not exceed eight hundred thousand souls,* including the suburbs of Scutari, Pera, Galata, &c., and to keep up this number, drained as the town constantly is by the plague, the provinces are totally exhausted. It may be easily imagined what a tax it is upon the latter, when it is considered that the plague of 1812 cut off three hundred and twenty thousand people in the capital, and the circumjacent villages along the Bosphorus; and that, to supply the deficiency, the surrounding country was depopulated. The city is of a triangular form, and lies upon a neck of land, rising with a steep aclivity into several mounts. These are inter-

* This includes five hundred and sixty-eight thousand Turks, one hundred thousand Greeks, eighty thousand Armenians, fifty thousand Jews, and two thousand Franks; such was Thousa's calculation before the late disturbances, and I deem it correct. The entire population of Turkey is thirty-three millions; eight millions in Europe, twenty-two millions in Asia, two millions in Egypt, and in Barbary (properly speaking) not above fifteen hundred thousand."†

† Madden's "Travels in the East," vol. i. p. 92.

sected by narrow lanes, for there is no thoroughfare deserving the name of a street; and the whole town is encompassed by crumbling walls and ancient turrets.

ARMY.

EFFECTIVE MILITARY FORCE OF TURKEY OF 1859.

(Donnèes approximatives, des statistiques de Baron de Reden.)

	MEN.
In European Turkey	35,300
In Asia, Corps de Anatolia, in which are included 25,350 men in Asia Minor .	27,150
Garrison of Constantinople and Scutari .	26,600
Total of effective force, beginning of 1859	89,050
ARMY OF RESERVE.	
The reserve (redif) of the military force of Turkey, in May, 1859, returned .	150,000
Total military force of Turkey .	230,050

NAVY.

8 Vessels of the Line.
12 Frigates
4 Corvettes
8 Brigs
9 Schooners
23 Steamers

Total 64 Vessels, of which 46 are armed.

RESOURCES OF THE TURKISH GOVERNMENT.

In 1824 I made some observations respecting the financial embarrassments of Turkey, which are applicable to the present state of things in the Ottoman Empire:—

"It has ever been a matter of surprise to me, how the government makes head against all its difficulties without borrowing money; and how the bulk of the Turkish population, without commerce, or agriculture, or manufacture, contrives to subsist, and to support the external appearance of opulence. Perhaps there are no people in Europe so well and so richly clad as the Turks, but where the means come from Heaven only knows. Every avocation that demands intellect is followed by a Christian; every trade which requires any extraordinary energy of mind or body, is usurped by a rayah. The Jew and the Armenian absorb no small share of the riches of the State, as bankers and money-brokers. The Greeks and Copts act as secretaries and factors to the merchants and grandees: such trades as shoemaking, embroidering, pipe boring, sword polishing, and silk weaving, are in the hands of the Turks. The Turkish merchants principally deal in rice and corn; every second shop in Constantinople is a baker's or a huckster's, and provisions appear to be the sole merchandise of the city.

"There is hardly a Turk of my acquaintance who leads not a life of indolence, who smokes not his pipe all day long, who spends not his time in sauntering from café to café, who sports not a splendid suite at the *Beiram*, the Turkish Easter, and who maintains not three or four wives, and double as many slaves; and yet he has no profession, no apparent income, no available resources. Such is the condition of two-thirds of the inhabitants of Constantinople. Within the last five years they have been greatly impoverished, and it is not to be wondered at: hitherto the revenues of the empire have arisen from the plunder of the nations that have been conquered, and the extortion that has been practised on the unfortunate provinces; and when it is considered that these provinces are farmed out to rapacious Pachas, who wring the last paras from the wretched peasant, and literally 'grind the faces of the poor,' it is no wonder that province after province should be made desolate, and that the revenues of the Sultan should diminish daily. The Greek insurrection in the Morea, and the loss of the prin-

cipal Islands in the Archipelago, struck a fatal blow at the Turkish finances. The total product of the commodities of the Morea, amounted, a few years ago, to six millions of francs; the revenues of the islands were solely applied to the marine, and barely sufficed for that purpose. Now, both the naval and military expenditure fall on the exhausted treasury.

What further ruin the expenses attendant on the prosecution of the war will produce, it is deplorable to consider, for notwithstanding the energy of Sultan Mahmoud, it is impossible for him to obviate the evils of bad government, of bad laws, and of an antiquated political religion, neither suited to the times, nor to the circumstances, of the State; he cannot alter the ordinances of the faith, he dare not subvert the principles of that religion, he cannot prevent misrule in the provinces, he cannot prevent rebellion in the Pachaliks of Syria. Though possessed of more energy of character than Sultan Selim, though insensible to fear, and unalterable in his purposes, he wants every quality but ferocity to make him even a Turkish hero. Inaccessible to counsel, he looks with contempt on all European sovereigns, and has not sufficient prudence to mask his animosity; devoid of generosity, the affections of his subjects are alienated from him, and everywhere I have been, the people have only panted for his death. Their last hope is in the succession of his son, and whenever that event takes place, the partial and temporary changes, which have been long meditated, and partly carried into effect, will fall to the ground.

"The Turks are accustomed to visit their national misfortunes on the heads of their Sultans; and so nothing is commoner now to hear, than execrations in the mouth of every woman, on the Sultan, because bread is dear, and money scarce.

"A respectable man called Yussif Effendi, with whom I am intimate, told me, in the presence of Doctor Perousel, that he and three of his friends were going to Egypt, 'to get beyond the grasp of a tyrant who had ruined his people.' I mention

this not because I agree with the Effendi in believing that the impoverishment of the country is to be attributed to the Sultan, but because it shows the feelings with which he is regarded by his people.

"Were he attacked, however, by the infidels, to-morrow, there is not one of his subjects who would not rally round the standard of the prophet, and account it an honour to fight for their Sultan. No matter how tyrannical he may have been, he is still to them the Zilullah, 'the image of God on earth.'"*

FINANCES.

THE ordinary revenue of the Turkish Empire, down to 1854, had fluctuated for several years from six millions sterling, to six millions and a half; five years later it rose to £6,880,000 sterling; a little later the official budget represented the revenue £7,310,000 sterling, and of that amount about one half was derived from the tribute paid by four provinces, of which amount, be it observed, the Egyptian tribute was set down at £300,000 sterling. The other sources of revenue, from taxation in Turkey Proper, are derived from two kinds of land tax, the tithe of the different productions of the soil, and animals connected with agriculture—with the exception of horses and horned cattle. This tax yields two millions sterling; it is not uniform however in its application. The other tax, denominated land tax, is in reality a kind of income tax on certain products and house property, and the fortunes of individuals engaged in trade or commerce. This tax is by no means uniform. Constantinople and its precincts are exempted from it; also ecclesiastical property called *vacoufs*, or endowments of mosques for pious or religious uses. These *vacoufs* are created by possessions granted in reversion to religious foundations, those who made them over having the power to transmit them without alienation to their direct male issue, a very trifling

* Madden's "Travels in Turkey, Nubia, and Palestine, in 1824, 25, 26, and 27." Lon. 8vo. 1829. vol. i. p. 32.

quit rent being paid until the extinction of the founder's issue, when the whole property devolves to the religious foundation on which it was settled. By means of this system of settlements, about one-third of the whole landed property of Turkey has passed into the hands of the church. The tax above mentioned, called *vergu*, yields two millions sterling.

REVENUE.

In the Gotha Almanach, for 1861, the receipts from all sources of Turkish revenue of the budget (actual) are given.

	Piastres.	£ Sterling.
Tithes Dimes	250,000,000	... *2,272,726
Imposts on Houses and Military Tribute . .	200,000,000	... 1,818,181
Custom House Duties . .	150,000,000	... 1,363,635
Pious Foundations . . .	100,000,000	... 909,090
Domains, Mines, Fisheries, &c. .	90,000,000	... 818,181
	790,000,000	7,181,813
In addition— Tribute of Egypt, Tunis and Danubian provinces applied to the payment of Interest and European Debts . . .	50,000,000	... 454,545
Total Revenue of Turkish Empire		... £7,636,358

EXPENDITURE.

The Gotha Almanach, for 1861, sets out the actual expenditure of the Turkish Government as follows, in piastres, which I have calculated at 110 piastres to the pound sterling in English money.

* In reducing piastres to English money, my calculation are made at the present rate of exchange of 110 piastres to the pound sterling.—R. M. M.

	Piastres.		£ Sterling.
The Civil List	100,000,000	...	909,090
Pensions	25,000,000	...	227,272
War	250,000,000	...	2,272,726
Artillery	25,000,000	...	227,272
Navy	60,000,000	...	545,454
Justice	10,000,000	...	90,909
Public Worship . . .	24,000,000	...	218,178
Agriculture and Public Works .	30,000,000	...	272,727
Police	6,000,000	...	54,540
Foreign Affairs . . .	10,000,000	...	90,090
Interior	160,000,000	...	1,454,544
Finances	60,000,000	...	545,454
Interest on Debt . . .	30,000,000	...	272,727
Total . . .	790,000,000		£7,180,983

The Expenditure of the Turkish Empire, we are informed by Ubicini, in 1853, was made up in the following manner; the several amounts in piastres being reduced to pounds sterling, at the then rate of exchange of ninety-six piastres to the pound sterling, would be as follows :—

	£ Sterling.
The Sultan's Civil List	690,000
The Civil List of the Sultana Valide, and Sultan's Married Sisters. . . .	77,280
The Army	2,760,000
The Navy	355,000
The Ordnance	276,000
The Civil Service	1,794,000
Embassies and Consulates	92,000
Public Works	92,000
Subvention to the Vacouts	115,000
For Arrears of Life Annuities . . .	36,800
Compensation for Ancient Fiefs Abolished .	368,000
Subvention to the Ottoman Bank . . .	276,000
Total of Expenditure . .	£6,932,080

The following is the Table Ubicini has given of the Revenue of the Turkish Empire, at the period of the publication of his work, in 1853, the rate of exchange being then ninety-six piastres to the pound sterling:—

	£ Sterling.
Tithes (of Produce, &c.)	2,200,000
Land Tax (a kind of Income Tax)	2,000,000
Capitulation Tax	400,000
Customs	800,000
Indirect Taxes.	1,500,000
Egyptian Tribute	300,000
Wallachian ditto	20,000
Moldavian ditto	10,000
Servian ditto	20,000
Total Revenue	£7,250,000

Ubicini states the Revenue receipts have more than doubled in twelve years, and had risen in 1853 to about seven millions sterling. But for the past seven years it appears, from the tables I have cited, there has been no increase.

The following detailed Table of Estimated Expenditure, for the year 1854, is taken from the last volume of Ubicini's work, published in that year. The rate of exchange being then ninety-six, the piastres are reduced into English money accordingly:—

	Piastres.	£ Sterling.
Sultan's Civil List	75,000,000	690,000
Sultana Valide's ditto	8,400,000	77,280
Army	300,000,000	2,700,000
Navy	37,500,000	355,000
Ordnance	30,000,000	276,000
Civil Service	195,000,000	1,794,000
Embassies and Consulates	10,000,000	92,000
Public Works	10,000,000	92,000
Subvention of Vacoufs	12,000,000	615,000
Arrears of Life Annuities	4,000,000	36,000
Compensation of Fiefs	40,000,000	368,000
Subvention to Ottoman Bank	30,000,000	276,000
Total Expenditure for 1854		**£7,371,280**

REVENUE ESTIMATED IN 1854.

[Fluctuates for several years from 650,000,000 to 750,000,000 piastres, or from £6,000,000 to 6,880,000.]

	Piastres		£.
Tithes	220,000,000	...	2,200,000
Land Tax.....	200,000,000	...	2,000,000
Capitation Tax ...	40,000,000	...	400,000
Customs	86,000,000	...	800,000
Indirect Taxes.....	150,000,000	...	1,500,000
Egyptian Tribute	30,000,000	...	300,000
Wallachian ,,	2,000,000	...	20,000
Moldavian ,,	1,000,000	...	10,000
Servian ,,	2,000,000	...	20,000
	731,000,000	...	7,250,000

Of this budget of £7,310,000 about £320,000 is furnished by the tributary provinces; the remaining items represent the whole amount of taxation in Turkey Proper.

Total revenue of vacoufs of the Turkish Empire, £20,000,000.

The civil servants of the Turkish Government are largely paid, if we are to judge from the official returns of their salaries in 1853. But many of these officials especially in the administration of the provinces, derive from their government employments double the amount of their stated salaries. The rate of exchange there being ninety-six piastres to the pound sterling.

The following is the Civil list of Civil Service charges for salaries of principal officers of State:—

PRIVY COUNCIL.

	£ Yearly Salary.
Grand Vizier	12,000
Shek-ul-Islam	11,040
Ministers having the rank of Musirs .	8,400
Dignitaries of the Second Class . .	3,000

CHANCERY OF STATE.

Functionaries of various categories, salaries varying from £100 and under to £1,860 per annum.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROVINCES.

		£.	£.
Governors General	salaries from	4,800	to 8,400
Kaimakans	,,	1,800	to 3,600
Mudirs	,,	600	to 1,200
Defterdars	,,		1,800
Malmudirs	,,		600

The Capitation tax (Khardj) in 1853 yielded £400,000 sterling. This impost formerly constituted the amount of tribute levied on a principality apportioned to its population, but the payment of which was guaranteed by the tributary prince or governor. It is now a poll tax, levied on every individual rajah in the Turkish dominions. By a firman of 1834, the Sultan fixed this poll-tax at 15, 30, or 60 piastres (in English money, 3s. 1½d., 6s. 3d., 12s. 6d. sterling) annually per head, the tax being proportioned to the circumstances of the payer, and levied only on males. Women, children, sick and infirm, the destitute, and priests of all persuasions, are exempted from it; computing those who pay and those who do not, the whole rajah population of the Sultan is estimated by Ubicini at nine millions. He says this estimate accords pretty nearly with the returns of the different religions he has given in a tabular form. But it certainly falls short of the numbers given in that table; and I cannot help thinking, his knowledge of the Christian populations and the statistics of them was by no means extensive.

The customs yield £800,000, derived from export and import duties, entrance dues, harbour dues, &c.

The indirect taxes yield a million and a half sterling, and are

derived from trade licenses, stamp duties, town dues, tolls, mines, fisheries, and postage of letters.

I am afraid the preceding returns will furnish a portion only of the exactions inflicted on the people of the provinces, the avantehs of rapacious governors, the extortions at the hands of corrupt functionaries, find no place in these official returns, and only a very small portion of the levies actually made by the farmers of customs and other taxes on the unfortunate people.

The foreign trade of Turkey in 1852 was as follows:—

Imports... £11,823,300 Exports... £10,644,450

Nearly one quarter of this is with England; viz:—

	PIASTRES.	£.
Imports . .	252,300,000 ...	2,300,000
Exports . .	130,500,000 ...	1,200,000

COMMERCIAL NAVIGATION OF THE PORT OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

Number of vessels entered . .	8,557
Tonnage	2,093,502

Of the above vessels, the flags in largest numbers were the following:—

	Vessels.
Greek	2,788
Austrian, Hanoverian, and Tuscan . .	1,706
English	1,358
Sardinian	1,163
French and Roman	465
Ionian	363
Norwegian	200
Neapolitan	148
Netherlands	100
Russian	97

Commercial navigation of Smyrna in 1857, from the same statistics :—

	£.
Total value of importations . .	3,186,140
Total value of exportations . .	3,121,539

Of the importations into Smyrna in that year the value of those from Great Britain amounted to nearly one third of the whole; it exceeded one million sterling.

COMMERCE OF TURKEY.

Ubicini estimated, in 1853, the foreign trade of Turkey, at £10,800,000 sterling.

England occupies the first rank in the trade.

The Levant Company, established in the reign of James I., supplanted the French in their commerce with Turkey.

The Levant Company was abolished about thirty years ago.

The total value of British exports to Turkey in 1827, amounted to £500,000 sterling. In 1853 it amounted to £2,420,000, an amount nearly double that of France, into the same country.

Austria, since the maritime states of the Republic of Venice has been added to its dominions, has become one of the first commercial powers in the Levant, where it sends, chiefly through Trieste, the great emporium of the trade of Germany with the Levant, either directly or indirectly in its transit to other parts, the cloths of Saxony and Rhenish Prussia, the glass of Bohemia, the amber of the Baltic, the manufactures of Switzerland and Belgium, and the silk goods of Lombardy, amounting to a proximate value of £3,300,000. The products, however, it must be borne in mind, of Prussia, Belgium, and Switzerland, constitute the great bulk of the value of Austrian exports to the Levant.

The exports of Russia to the Levant in 1851 were £1,150,000.

THE PUBLIC DEBT OF TURKEY IN 1854.

(From the Statisque de l'Europe, by the Baron de Reden.)

	£.
Capital of the Rentes *Sehim*	316,168
Capital of the Rentes for the Indemnity of the Fiefs	3,437,538
Capital of the Rentes to the Bank and Capitalized for Retiring Depreciated Metallic Currency, and Paper Money for a term of fifteen years from 1852	2,604,165
Paper Money (Kaimes) issued since 1829 .	1,979,166
Floating Debt and Deficit	2,656,248
	10,993,285
In addition to the above.	
Loan guaranteed in 1854 by France and England	5,000,000
Loan contracted in 1856	12,000,000
Loan contracted at Constantinople in 1858 .	572,916
Total of Public Turkish Debt, down to 1859 .	28,566,201

PUBLIC DEBT OF TURKEY IN 1861.

From the Almanach de Gotha, for 1861, the following statement is extracted :—

FOREIGN PUBLIC DEBT (MAY, 1860).

	£ STERLING.
English Loan in 1854, at 6 per cent. . .	3,000,000
,, 1855, at 4 ,, . . .	5,000,000
,, 1858, at 6 ,, . . .	5,000,000
	£13,000,000
From which there is to be deducted payments made	
On the Loan of 1854. . . £150,000	
,, 1855 . . 200,000	
,, 1858 . . 50,000	
	400,000
	£12,600,000

TOTAL DEBT TO MAY 1861.

	Piastres at 110 to the £	£ Sterling.
Rents Schim, at 8 per cent. .	80,000,000 ...	727,000
Hasneh Tahvil, at 6 per cent .	250,000,000 ...	2,270,000
Consols, at 6 per cent . .	250,000,000	
Redeemed in 1860 and less by .	5,000,000	
	245,000,000 ...	2,227,000
		17,824,000
To be deducted—Treasury Payments from time to time on Hasneh Tahvili and Consols . .		474,000
		17,350,000
False Money and Remainder of Old Paper Money		2,150,000
Debts to Bankers of Constantinople and Galata .		3,000,000
Debts of the Civil List		4,700,000
Debts of Ministry of War and Arsenal . .		2,800,000
Total Debt of Turkey to May, 1860 .		£30,000,000
To the preceding debt is to be added the loan contracted in Paris through Mirés and Co., in January, 1861 ; and the issue of Treasury Bonds and Paper Money, determined on in the month of March, 1861, by the advice, as it is stated in the public prints, of the British Ambassador ; the two additional items making a sum of about		10,000,000
Additional debts of the Civil Lists, from May 1860, to May 1861		1,000,000
Additional debts of the Ministry of War and Arsenal, for same period		1,000,000
Total Public Debt of Turkey, to May 1st, 1861 .		£42,000,000

In October and November, 1860, the Sublime Porte was brought almost to the last extremity, in one of those pecuniary crises of such frequent occurrence ever since unfortunate Turkey, by her ability to raise loans and contract a great national debt, has attained that height of civilization which qualifies her to take one of the lower places in the imperial edifice of kings and princes of great mark and credit in Europe —of a great figure in national debt respectability.

In this crisis the desperate efforts of the Ministry of the Sultan to obtain a loan were *amused* (as the French would say), deluded, favored or baffled, by the intervention of the foreign ambassadors at the Porte, as the several interests of Europeans were supposed to be affected by the embarrassments of the sick man, and the efforts made to relieve him.

The Constantinople correspondent of a leading London journal, of the 20th of November, 1860, writes on this subject:

"The contract relative to this financial operation will, it is expected, arrive by the French packet to-morrow; it will be immediately laid before the Council, signed, and sent back to France by the first mail. The loan has been contracted at 53¾, so that the Treasury will only receive 213 millions for the 400. When this operation shall have been completed, the Bank of Turkey will commence its business, as the caution money has been deposited and the capital subscribed. . . . . The Porte, after having paid off some of its most pressing debts, will probably devote a portion of the loan to calling in the paper money, which has legal currency only in the capital, and causes the most ruinous variations in the rate of exchange. The quantity of forged bank notes in circulation is immense. A short time since the Ottoman Bank received from the Minister of Finance a large payment, in which there were found no less than 3,000 piastres of forged notes. The cashier of the bank noticed the fact to the Treasury clerk, when the answer was, 'Let them pass; forged or not, it is always paper money.' The English capitalists are not well pleased with the loan being negotiated in France, and, in order to throw obstacles in

the way, they are said to have offered to lend the same sum for sixty-five. The offer was tempting, but the Turkish government clung to the Paris loan, fearing that if it hesitated it might realise the old proverb of the two stools. While the above negotiations were in progress, the murmurs of the army rendered an immediate supply of money necessary, and overtures were made to the bankers at Galata for a loan of fifteen millions of piastres. The English Ambassador, hearing of it, represented to A'ali Pacha, the Caimacan of the Grand Vizier, that to effect such a paltry loan would reflect disgrace on the government, and, as an inducement to get the arrangement broken off, said he would procure one of fifty millions. Riza Pacha did not wish to lose the substance for the shadow; but fearing to offend the British Ambassador, the negotiation for the fifteen millions was broken off. The fifty millions, however, not being forthcoming, the application to the bankers was renewed, when they in their turn refused. The Sultan became impatient, and ordered that the money should be procured, and Riza Pacha was compelled to raise three small loans on the security of his own property. By that means the murmurs of the troops have been for a time stopped. Almost all the gold which is to be seen in the different bazaars in this capital has come from Syria, being the booty of the pillage carried on in that country. There may be seen a number of coins strung on cords, and which form the ornaments of the females, as necklaces, head-dresses, &c. This custom generally prevails among the Christians of the empire, but more particularly so in the Lebanon. Thousands of other stolen articles from the same source may be seen on the stalls of the dealers."

A singularly able article, on the subject of Turkish Finance, was recently published in a London periodical, the author of it being evidently most thoroughly acquainted with Turkey and its institutions:

THE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF TURKEY.

"In the observations which we propose to make upon the financial condition of Turkey, we take it for granted that our readers coincide with us in believing that the preservation of that empire from ruin and dismemberment is, at least for the present, an object of the highest importance to the interests of England, as well as to the general tranquillity and prosperity of Europe. If, therefore, in the treatment of this question, we appear to bear hard upon the 'sick man' whom we wish to save, it is only because we feel assured that his wounds must be honestly and deeply probed before they can be cured: there is still vitality in the body, but disease has made such extensive progress, that unless some effective remedy can be found, mortification must soon ensue.

If the finances of a country are in complete disorder, the whole heart is sick, the whole body faint; if the government *employés*, the army, navy, artisans, and labourers do not receive regular and sufficient remuneration for their services, the necessary consequence is oppression and corruption in the upper classes, with general discontent and misery in the lower That such is the present state of Turkey, her most sincere well-wishers are compelled unwillingly to admit; the few enlightened statesmen of whom she can boast have felt and admitted it likewise, but they have never had the power or the self-devotion to lay the axe to the root of the evil, and the palliatives hitherto applied have only plastered over a sore that is festering beneath. The events that have occurred during the last two months in Turkey must have convinced these gentlemen, as they have convinced us, that nothing short of an entire and fundamental change in the system of financial administration can save the empire from the fate that threatens it. We have seen that while the Grand Vizier, Mahomed Kupristi Pacha (one of the few high Turkish functionaries to whose honour it may be said that his hands disdain a bribe),

has been making an official progress through the north of European Turkey to examine abuses, dismiss cruel and rapacious governors, and inquire into the grievances complained of by the Christian population, at the very same time there occurred in Asiatic Turkey a wholesale massacre of Christian men, women, and children, which the cowardly Turkish governor, with the small body of brutal, fanatic soldiery under his command, seems rather to have abetted than to have taken any measures of prevention or repression. The Turkish government must be aware, if it has intelligence enough to read the signs of the times, that Europe in the nineteeth century will not permit the perpetration of such atrocities, and that if they are not effectually remedied, all considerations of the balance of power, and the other difficulties involved in the solution of the great Eastern question, will be swept away by the torrent of indignation which will break forth from the assembled nations of Christendom.

To return to our text. The Turks have a proverb, which although ostensibly referring to a fish, is applied by them with equal force and truth to government administration. "Bâluk bâshîndan kokar"—Corruption begins at the head. Here is the great secret of Oriental misgovernment, and here also the great difficulty, not of finding, but of applying a remedy. Eastern sovereigns suck in adulation with their nurse's milk; their years of infancy and boyhood are spent in a harem, where they are surrounded by silly uneducated women, and still more silly and uneducated eunuchs, who vie with each other in gratifying all the young prince's whims, indulging all his caprices, and filling his head with the most exaggerated notions of his own perfections, greatness, and power. As he grows older and attains the latter half of his teens, the women and the eunuchs are exchanged for the parasite and the pander, and thus he is often called upon to assume the reins of absolute power with passions that have never known a check, and an understanding that has been trained to consider 'sic volo, sic jubeo' as the alpha and omega of administration. Is it to be

wondered at that an unfortunate prince so educated should be unable and unwilling as sovereign to reform enormous abuses, which have been the growth of centuries, and which it is the interest of the greedy flatterers and courtiers by whom he is surrounded to maintain? Nevertheless, the Turkish Empire (two-thirds of the population of which on this side of the Bosphorus are Christian) is now so deeply implicated in all the concerns, social, political, commercial, and financial, of the great European family, that its sovereign must, if he wishes to preserve his throne, accept and adopt those rules of government which are recognised as the basis of all right and law among civilized nations; and as it is a melancholy farce to see the Grand Vizier inquiring into the grievances of the Christians on the Danube, while they are being massacred by hundreds and thousands in Syria, so in finance is it no less lamentably absurd to nominate a commission (such as is now sitting) to inquire into its condition, while the grossest corruption and the most wanton extravagance exist in every department of administration, the most flagrant example being found (as before mentioned) at the head. But even if this be admitted, where shall we find a Turkish statesman with a tongue sufficiently oily and a courage proof against drugged coffee or a bow string, to tell these home truths to the august majesty of Islam? We have heard indeed, that among the viziers who have on various occasions been charged with a revision and reform of the financial system, one, if not more than one, has ventured most humbly to suggest that Majesty would name and limit itself to some fixed amount for the court expenditure; but the presumptuous idea was nipped in the bud; the whale continued to disport itself in the waters of extravagance, while the finance minister was permitted to exercise his reformatory ingenuity upon the gudgeons and minnows. Yet here, and here alone can any reform, to be effective, begin, and here, if Osmanli Majesty wishes for an enduring rule at Constantinople, it *must* ere long begin, not only because the Court is taken and followed as an example by all Turkish

governors, viziers, &c., &c., but because the most able and consciencious finance minister cannot frame a budget, or form any comparative estimate of income and expenditure, unless he knows whether the demands of the Court on the public purse will amount to one million or to three. We have already stated that the two concurrent causes, which have produced, and still produce, the present ruined condition of Turkish finance, are wanton extravagance and general corruption. We will commence with the former; but before entering on its details, we must premise that we cannot admit the correctness of the financial statistics of Turkey, published to the European public in the *Almanac de Gotha*, and declared by that publication to be based on the statistic statements of Baron de Reden; we shall prefer those gathered from intelligent and well-informed residents at Constantinople, confirmed as they mostly are, by official returns published in that capital. All the salaries and items of expenditure of any considerable amount are quoted in 'kysas,' or purses, and as the purse represents on an average £5, we shall reduce the whole to sterling money.

"Commencing with the Court. The 'khazine-khasse,' or private purse of the sovereign, is put down at £250,000; to this have to be added the annual allowances for the Sultan's mother and stepmothers, his Majesty's brother, his sons, his sisters, married daughters, and sons-in-law, which amount in all to about £200,000 more, making up the sum of £450,000. This sum does not include the expenditure of the special royal harem, nor the building, furnishing, and maintenance of the numerous royal palaces, nor the salaries of Court functionaries and servants. Those who have been in Constantinople, and have had an opportunity of seeing something of the luxury and extravagance displayed in those palaces will coincide with us in believing that the above items, not included in the £450,000, would go far towards doubling that sum. But this is not all, for a whim or caprice either of the sovereign, or any member of his Majesty's family, may at any time produce an extra item of expenditure, over which no Minister can exercise the slightest

control. We give one instance—*ex uno disce omnes*:—A year or two ago, one of the Wâledah Sultanahs, or, as we should call them, 'Queen Mothers,' made the pilgrimage to Mecca, a proceeding against which, as being a meritorious, if not an obligatory one in the Moslem faith, we have no objection to offer. Every one knows that, with the means of communication now existing, the devout lady, attended by a becoming suite of twenty or thirty persons, might have embarked at Constantinople for Alexandria, where the Viceroy would have passed them on with all comfort and honour to Suez, whence another steamer would have conveyed them on to Djeddah; from thence an easy ride of two days would have brought them to Mecca. If, after the pilgrimage, they had returned by the same route, the whole voyage, if performed in the most leisurely manner, would not have occupied two months. And, supposing the great lady to have paid for everything, and to have made customary presents with royal generosity, the amount spent on her pilgrimage could not have exceeded £5,000. But so unpretending a journey, and so modest an expenditure were not consonant with Turkish ideas or precedents. The royal lady must go the whole way by land, a journey of 1,600 or 1,800 miles, three-fourths of it over sandy deserts, where every comfort and luxury to which she was accustomed in the seraglio was to be conveyed on the backs of camels, accompanied by a suite of two hundred, including women, eunuchs, pipe-bearers, cooks, carpet spreaders, and heaven knows what beside. This royal victim of bigoted ostentation, performed her weary journey over those desolate wastes, bringing back with her probably some baskets of holy earth from Mecca, a few bottles of bitter water from the fountain of Zem Zem, and a small bill for the Turkish treasury to pay, amounting to £55,000. Probably our readers will coincide with us in believing that if this pious lady had enjoyed, like European Princesses, a fixed revenue or appanage, out of which all her expenses were to be defrayed, she would have preferred the more direct, easy, and economical route to Mecca *viâ* Egypt. This example, one of hundreds that

might be adduced, brings us back to our theme—viz., that there never will or can be even a commencement of reform in the administration, until the expenditure of the Sultan's Court is limited to a certain definite amount. Descending from the Sovereign to his ministers, we come first to the grand vizier, whose salary from the treasury is £12,000 a-year; after him come the Sheik el Islam, President of the Council, Commander of the Forces, Master of the Ordnance, Capudan Pacha (Admiral of the Fleet), and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, each of whom has £800 a month, or £9,600 a year. Here we have already nearly £70,000 a year paid as salary to the seven chief ministers; after them we come to the second class, who have the rank of Pachas, and are called Mushirs, or Councillors, who receive each a salary of a hundred purses a month, or £6,000 a year. We are not able to state exactly the number of these Mushirs, because it is limited only by the pleasure of the Sultan; but in the *Almanac de Gotha* of the current year, we find twenty of them, of whom fifteen are called *Ministres sans Portefeuille*. This list is certainly defective, as we know several Mushirs who are not included in it; but even taking it as it is, the united salaries of these ministers of the second class amount to £120,000 a year.

"It is very difficult to make a correct computation of the number of the Ulema, or of the salaries which they receive. In Roumelia, there are twelve of the higher class, who receive each about £3,000 a year; in Constantinople there are upwards of twenty at salaries of £1,500 each; and in Anatolia, where their salaries are £2,500, there cannot be less than forty, the whole of Asia Minor, Syria, and Bagdad, being comprehended under that head. We leave untouched the salaries of cadis diplomatic employés, officers in the army and navy, because they are necessary to the Turkish as to every other government, and are extravagant neither as to number nor as to the amount of pay.

"As England is supposed to be the richest country in the world, and its public servants the highest paid, we need only

compare the preceding figures with the salaries paid in our country, in order to satisfy ourselves of the wasteful prodigality of Turkish Administration. The revenue of Great Britain is about £70,000,000; that of Turkey about £10,000,000. The salaries of the English Cabinet, consisting of fifteen members at an average of £5,000 each, amount to £75,000 a year; while those of the Turkish Ministry (Mushirs included) amount, as above shown to about £190,000; or, to put it in a homely phrase, a gentleman with an income of £700 a year, spends nearly three times as much on agency, as his neighbour who has £7,000.

"If we compare the actual expenditure of the Courts of the two sovereigns, the proportion will be nearly the same as between the two administrations. Having now given a sketch of the recognised expenditure, of the 'upper ten thousand,' in the Turkish Empire, the task that we proposed at the outset would bring us to the consideration of the second branch of our subject, namely, the corruption existing in the administration. . . . . The said corruption is so diffused through every department of the State, that it forms the rule, and not the exception, and therefore to particularize it would be in fact to describe the whole administrative system. It extends not only to every department of the public service, but also to all the social relations of life, poisoning justice at the fountain head, sapping the foundations of the State, and extinguishing in the individual character, every feeling of honour, integrity, and self-respect. Thus, for instance, the Court and the great viziers and governors make it a rule to keep an enormous retinue of attendants and servants, but few of these receive any salary, and consequently they depend almost, if not altogether, for their existence on the plunder which they can squeeze, by fair means or foul, out of those who have any business to transact with, or any claim or petition to present to, their patron. You will scarcely find an employé, from a governor to a cowass, who will not prove to you, that in order to live he must oppress, cheat, and squeeze those beneath him. He has been made to pay so

high a bribe for the post that he fills, and the term of his tenure is so uncertain, that unless he can find means to double or treble its legitimate emoluments, he risks being a loser by accepting it; therefore he hastens, by every species of extortion to scrape together all that he can, so that after a year or two, when his probable removal is hinted at, he may be able either to give another bribe for the retention of his post, or to carry off something with him in his retirement. And as to the Cadis and the Ulema, the volumes that have been written illustrative of their gross and barefaced venality, however amusing they may be to read, yet fall far short of the truth, as it may be seen daily exemplified in the East; and as for poverty with right pleading a cause successfully against power with a purse, such an event may take place when the Tigris shall flow up from Basrah to Bagdad, but not till then. It is needless to say that in such a land there can neither be industry nor enterprise. Who will sow that another may reap? Woe be to the man who is reputed rich; he is marked forthwith as a fit subject for the process of squeezing, and a pretext is easily made, and as easily dispensed with.

"Neither is the military service a whit behind the civil in the race of corruption. There also, while the officer plunders the soldier of his pay, clothes and rations, the soldier plunders the peasant, and the Pacha or the General in his turn plunders the Colonel. These worthies drive their best trade in the provinces, at a distance from Constantinople, especially among the Bashi Bozucs, where the officer in command draws pay and rations for scores of soldiers who do not exist; and when a Pacha comes to inspect the regiment, he receives the present of a horse, and the vacant gaps are filled by men borrowed from neighbouring depôts.

"Such being the social, political, and financial condition of Turkey, the wonder is not that it should be always in debt and difficulty, but that it should not ere this have crumbled to pieces. It must be admitted, however, that the Turk, notwithstanding the disadvantages under which he labours as a semi-civilized

Asiatic dwelling in Europe, is in his own nature honest and straightforward. He has neither the cleverness, the enterprise, nor the duplicity of the Greek: hence the whole commerce of Turkey is in the hands of the latter, while banking and most other money transactions are monopolized by the Armenians.

"Both Arabs and Persians are strongly imbued with a mercantile spirit, and the latter would, under a just and settled government, become a very industrious agricultural people. Not so the Turk; in his natural state, as he is still to be found in the regions south east of the Caspian, he is a bold, hardy nomad, addicted to the foray and the chase; in Constantinople, he has become enervated by years of luxury, and is the most indolent and effeminate of men. His pipe and his harem are all that he knows of pleasure or occupation, and with a lazy fatalism for his creed, he lets the world jog on, content with the oft-repeated utterance of the two chief articles of his faith, 'we shall see,' and 'God is great.' Such is the Stambouli Turk, and though there are in the Ministry a few enlightened men, educated at Paris, and well informed on European politics, they are too few and feeble to leaven the inert Osmanli lump. How, then, is the Turkish Empire to be saved? if it is undermined by a wide-spread corruption such as we have described, and threatened externally by dangers so grave as fanatic revolt and bloodshed in Syria, and the ever-recurring difficulties arising in the Danubian provinces and Montenegro, how is it to avoid the ruin which has of late been so frequently predicted? The mutual jealousies of European Powers have done much, and may yet do much to avert the impending storm, but they cannot do all; they may for a season protect it against external violence, but if they sap the foundations of their own citadel, *mole ruat suâ*, and none can save it."*

All modern reformations in countries revolutionized or constitutionalized to any extent, commence by borrowing money at enormous rates of interest—contracting a national debt and encumbering the revenues with the future payment of the

* Frazer's Magazine for October, 1860.

interest on the loans effected. A national bank is necessitated by a national debt, and both call into existence stock-jobbers, fundholders, and mercantile speculators in the new paper money market.

The evil results of the old governmental system of overcoming occasional pecuniary difficulties by depreciating the metallic currency, and at the same time retaining its original nominal value, it was said would be got rid of by the Turkish government by the new civilized mode of raising the wind; but in all probability it will prove, in a very short time, far more disastrous to Turkey than the old barbarous method of tampering with the currency of the country.

The Turkish Government began the new financial system by issuing Treasury Bonds, in 1841, to the extent of £552,000—this new paper money bearing a yearly interest of twelve per cent. In the following year, however, a portion of the bonds was repaid, and the interest reduced to six per cent.

In a short time new issues of Treasury Bonds were made, increasing the total amount in circulation to about a million and a half sterling.

Enormous difficulties were occasioned by the unsettled state of the exchange, and gigantic frauds connected with surreptitious importations of debased coin from England and some other European countries. It became necessary to found a bank, and accordingly, in 1844, the Bank of Constantinople was established. This institution did not work well. The Government, in 1848, was mainly instrumental in establishing another—the first Imperial Bank of Constantinople (its first Directors, Messrs. Allen and Balazzi). This proved a ruinous speculation. The Imperial Bank was obliged to wind up its affairs in 1852, with a deficit of nearly £400,000, which the Government had to meet.

No sooner was the Imperial Bank of Constantinople smashed, than the Government tried to raise a loan in Europe, and

failed in the attempt. Then, as a *dernier* resource for the embarrassed Government, another bank was determined on; and accordingly a company was formed to establish one, and a new bank came into being in 1853, called "the Ottoman Bank," and is still in existence. Its duration is fixed at fifteen years; during that period the Government guarantees an annual contribution of thirty millions of piastres—in English money, £2,727,271 sterling—a-year; in consideration of which the Bank undertakes to withdraw from circulation the depreciated coinage, to repay the State at the expiration of fifteen years, without interest, the Treasury Bonds, and to maintain them at par till that time. Since the Ottoman Bank was established (seven years ago), the Government has managed to effect several loans, and a new element of ruin in the finances of Turkey is the result of its unfortunate success in those transactions in the European money markets.

Every available resource of Turkish revenue that is large and tolerably certain of realization, is hypothecated to some extent, more or less—the largest and surest generally to the greatest extent. Thus, the Imperial loan of 1858, negotiated by Messrs. Dent, Palmer, and Co., of London, is especially secured by the customs duties and Government octroi levied at Constantinople. For the security and punctual payment of the interest on another loan, the tribute of the Viceroy of Egypt is *hypothecated*. For the security of another loan and payment of interest thereon, the large annual stipend paid by the Oriental Steam Company, for aid and protection given to the overland transit service, is likewise hypothecated; and so it is with several other sources of revenue,—they are mortgaged to a considerable extent, the ordinary resources of revenue are considerably diminished, and the Government of Turkey has now come to this lamentable condition, that it can subsist only from one year to another by contracting debt and effecting loans on ruinous terms. For instance, on a particular transaction, contracting for a loan at 53¾, an obligation to

pay four hundred millions of piastres and receiving only current money to the amount of two hundred and thirteen millions.

The unfortunate concomitant of all modern reforms—national debt, has not been wanting in the efforts made in the past quarter of a century to regenerate the Turkish Empire. With Turkish reform began financial embarrassment, peculation on a grand scale on the part of exalted public functionaries, extravagance, expenditure beyond income, recourse to foreign money markets for loans—finally, a public debt of upwards of forty-two millions. Better for Turkey the Russian enemy were on her frontiers than the money-jobbers of France and England slingeing about her Treasury, bargaining with her Ministers of Finance, or dancing attendance on her diplomatic agents in London or Paris; or her Ministers of State were negotiating loans, mortgaging revenues that admit of no expansion, tying up resources to meet interest on foreign debts that were barely sufficient for the ordinary expenditure of Government.

The dissolution of the Turkish Government is now a question of time; her finances must inevitably bring about that event. In other countries, where money is borrowed by the State, means exist and are employed to raise additional revenue to meet the new charges of interest, &c., on the debt incurred. In Turkey no such means exist; she must henceforth live on loans, and when she can get no more she must break down, and in her bankrupt state she will have to encounter no lack of sedition and turbulent fanaticism at home, and of watchful enmity on the part of her old adversaries in adjoining countries, ready to pounce on her as their prey.

If France or England could afford the expense of an annual subsidy of six or eight millions a year to the Sultan, and thought the interests of civilization and Christianity were likely to be promoted by this *subvention* of Mohammedanism, the Turkish Empire could be upheld possibly for some years to

come, unless some new and unforeseen cause of ruin were to manifest itself in the meantime; but under any circumstances, and with any amount of temporary relief afforded to her, humanly speaking, there are no elements of soundness in her constitution—it is rotten at the heart's core, and it is not in the power of man to revive, or restore, or to sustain it.

END OF VOL. I.

THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

IN ITS RELATIONS WITH

CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

BY

RICHARD ROBERT MADDEN,

Fel. R.C.S. Eng., M.R.I.A., &c.

Author of "Travels in Turkey, Egypt, Syria, and Palestine," "Egypt and Mahommed Ali," "The Mussulman," "Life and Martyrdom of Savonarola," "Infirmities of Genius," "Memoirs of the Countess of Blessington," &c.

VOL. II.

London:

T. CAUTLEY NEWBY,

PUBLISHER, 30, WELBECK STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE.

1862.

CONTENTS OF CHAPTERS OF VOL. II.

CHAPTER.		PAGE
I.	Syria—Its Divisions, Sects, and Races	1
II.	Syria under Mohammed Ali	43
III.	The Greek Rayah Community of the so-called "Orthodox Church.—Constitution of the Greek Church in Russia and Turkey.—The proposed Re-Union of the Greek and Latin Churches	51
IV.	Proposed Re-Union of the Greek and Latin Churches	87
V.	The Armenian Community	117
VI.	The Maronites	153
VII.	The Order of the Assassins of Persia and Syria of the 11th and 12th centuries, and the derivation from them of the existing secret sects of Syria	162
VIII.	The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Ansayrii	195
IX.	The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Druses	209
X.	The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Metoualis	237
XI.	The influence of Russia over the Great Mass of the Christian Population of the Turkish Empire—The Exercise and Results of that Influence at Different Periods of the Greek Revolution	248
XII.	The Syrian Massacres of Christians by the Druses and Turkish Authorities, in 1860	266
XIII.	Observations on Latest Official Correspondence Relating to Massacres in Syria—Withdrawal of French Troops; and Labors of International Commission	370
XIV.	Death of Sultan Abdul Medjid and Accession of his Brother Abdul Azis—Latest Statement of Financial Statistics of Turkey	387
XV.	The Beginning of The End of The Turkish Empire—Failure of its Institutions to Fulfil the Legitimate Purposes of Governmental Regime—The Well-being and Protection of the People subjected to it—The Decay of Turkey and Impossibility of its Maintenance and Restoration	409

(For Contents of Appendix see over.)

APPENDIX.—VOL. II.

NO.		PAGE
I.	Sir Moses Montefiore, Bart., the Originator of The Relief Committee in aid of The Christian Sufferers of Syria, in the late Disturbances	437
II.	Numbers of Believers in Mohammedanism and Buddhism, and and Latest Estimate of Population of the Globe . .	441
III.	List of Ottoman Sovereigns	442
IV.	Dates of Different Crusades	443
V.	The Suez Canal Project	444

THE TURKISH EMPIRE,

IN ITS RELATIONS WITH CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

CHAPTER I.

Syria—Its Divisions, Sects, and Races.

THERE are few regions in the globe that have undergone more revolutions, have had more names assigned to them, and provinces more frequently confounded, than those of Syria. In its numerous revolutions the different races have become so intermixed, that their original characters have been nearly lost altogether.

Volney counts ten invasions of Syria in the course of 2,500 years that have introduced different foreign nations of a distinct origin.

1. The Assyrians of Nineveh, passing the Euphrates, about 750 years before the Christian Æra, sent Colonies into Syria, and in the course of sixty years, were masters of nearly the whole region north of Judea.

2. The Chaldeans of Babylon followed the Assyrians, obtained all the possessions of the latter in Syria, and completed the conquest of that country, with the exception of Tyre.

3. Next came the Persians into Syria, under Cyrus, as conquerors and masters.

4. The Macedonian rule, under Alexander, succeeded the Persian dominion in Syria.

5. Then yielding to the arms of Pompey, Syria became a province of the Roman Empire.

6. Four centuries later, when the sons of Theodosius divided their vast patrimony, Syria was annexed to the Empire of Constantinople.

7. In 622 A.D., the hordes of Arabia, under the banners of Mohammed, ravaged various parts of Syria, and retained possession of some strongholds.

8. The Saracens of the Fatimite and Ommiade dynasties alternately established their power in Syria, and the unhappy country became the theatre of their wars for upwards of three centuries.

9. Turcoman hordes supervened on the ruins of the Saracen power, and obtained possession of several of the chief cities and towns of Syria.

10. Next came the Crusaders, who obtained possession of four or five towns and cities of importance, and, in their turn, were dispossessed by the Mamelukes of Egypt, and Saracens of Damascus; then suddenly the hordes of Tartary, under Timour, swept over Syria, ravaged and desolated the unhappy country, and disappeared as swiftly as they came, and were replaced by the Ottoman Turks, who have now been the ruthless masters and barbarous rulers of Syria, in all its extent, for upwards of four hundred years.

The Romans gave the name Palœstina to the territory included in Judea in its largest extent, to the exclusion however of Phœnicia. They divided Palestine into four regions,—Galilea, Samaria, Judea, and Perea. Palestine corresponds to the land of Canaan, and its name is probably a corruption from that of the Philistines, which occupied a region westward of this land of Canaan.

The name of Syria has been given to this region of Asia Minor, extending north and south (along the Mediterranean), from the Gulf of Alexandretta southward to Gaza, an extreme

length of about three hundred miles; and east and west, from the shores of the Mediterranean, westward, from Beirout to Palmyra, its greatest breadth of settled and permanently occupied territory, of about one hundred and fifty miles.

This name of Syria, transmitted to us from the Greeks, is an abridgment of that of Assyria, first adopted by the Ionians, who frequented their coasts, after Syria had become a province of Assyria.

Abraham Ortelius, in his "Synonymia Geographica" (4to. Aut. 1578), article Syria, tells us that this country was called by the Hebrews, Aram, as St. Jerome testifies. Homer called the people of this country Arimos; and Strabo speaks of them in his day as being still designated Arimos. Josephus calls them Syros Aramœos. Diodorus Siculus speaks of Syria Superior and Inferior. Pliny divides Palestine into several regions:—Palestina, Judea, Cœle, Phœnice, Damascena, Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Sophene (or Sophanina), Comagène, Adiabene, and Antiochia.*

Fuller, in his "Historie of the Holy War" (Book i. ch. 18), says that Palestine, in David's time, maintained a population of 1,300,000 men, besides women, children, and impotent persons; exclusive also of the tribes of Benjamin and Levi, as we are informed in Holy Writ. "Palestine (says Fuller) is bounded on the north by Mount Libanus; west by the Mediterranean Sea; south, by the wilderness of Paran, parting it from Egypt; and the East, by the mountains of Gilead, and the river of Arnon. The soil of this region was transcendantly fruitful. Palestine contained four provinces, Gallilee, Trachonitis (beyond the Jordan), Judea, and Samaria."

In the article on Palestine, Ortelius, in his "Synonymia Geographica," says, "Ptolomy, in his geography, refers to this region, which in the Scriptures is called Elisthem—Canaan—and the Promised Land." St. Jerome (in Locis Hebræicis) says, "It is to be borne in mind, in historical accounts of this

* See Ortelius's "Synonymia Geographica," p. 308.

country, that Judea belongs to Palestine, but Galilea and Samaria belong to Phœnicia." "But now (continues Ortelius) by all Europeans, this country is called the Holy Land, in various terms belonging to different languages, but having the same significations. The Arabs designate Syria by the name Barr-el-Sham, which signifies, "The country to the left."

The promise made (A.M. 2023) to the father of the Jewish people, who came out of Ur, of the Chaldeas, and dwelt in Haran—"And the Lord said to Abram: Go forth, out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and out of thy father's house, and come into the land which I will show to thee," was followed by the departure of Abram, his household and his people; his passage through the Vale of Sichem, and his coming into the Land of Canaan. And there "The Lord appeared unto Abram, and said to him: To thy seed will I give this land." And passing on from thence to a mountain that was on the east side of Bethel, he there pitched his tent, Bethel on the west, and Hai on the east; he built there an altar to the Lord, and called upon his name. And then, we are informed, he went forward, and proceeded to the south, and again returned to Bethel.

Abram dwelt henceforward in the land of Canaan, but Lot and his herdsmen, "Chose to himself the country about the Jordan, and he departed from the east."*

Four hundred and seventy-five years passed over, "And the Lord spoke to Moses the same day (on which speaking to all Israel, he said to the wanderers of forty years in the desert, he commanded them to fulfil the law, 'that they might continue a long time in the land whither they were going over the Jordan to possess it.') Saying: Go up into this mountain, Abarim (that is to say, of the Passages), unto Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab, over against Jericho, and see the land of Canaan, which I will deliver unto the children of Israel to possess, and die thou in the mountain. . . . Thou shalt see

* Genesis ch. xiii.

the land before thee, which I will give to the children of Israel, but thou shalt not enter into it."*

"Then Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto Mount Nebo, to the top of Phasgah, over against Jericho, and the Lord showed him all the land of Galaad, as far as Dan."†

In the Book of Joshua, chap. i. v. 2, 3, 4, we read that after the death of Moses, the Lord spoke unto Joshua, and said:—

"Moses, my servant, is dead; arise, and pass over this Jordan, thou, and thy people with thee, unto the land which I will give unto the children of Israel.

"I will deliver unto you every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon, as I have said to Moses.

"From the desert and from Libanus, unto the great river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, unto the great sea towards the going down of the sun, shall be your border."

These limits would include Phœnicia and its principal towns. "Beirout was included in the land of promise (observes Dr. Thompson, in "The Land and the Book," Lond. Ed. 8vo. 1860. p. 19.), but hardly in the land of possession, being one of the seaports of Phœnicia, a country that continued, after the settlement of the Israelites, to be inhabited by the remarkable people who gave it its name. The great size and importance of Beirout are quite modern, indeed within the last thirty years."

It is not mentioned in Scripture under its present name.

Beirout, the ancient Berytus, the place supposed to have its name from the idol, Baal Berith, subsequently named Julia Felix, by Augustus, on account of the fertility and beauty of the adjoining country, still later was the chief place of residence of the Emir Faccardine. The Emir Faccardine, says Maundrell, was, in the reign of Sultan Marat (Sultan Amurath), the fourth Emir, or Prince of the Druses.

Tyre, the principal city of Phœnicia, was founded by a colony from the neighbouring city of Sidon—as Larcher sup-

* Deuteronomy ch. xxxii. vv. 48, 49, 52.

† Ibid, ch. xxxiv. v. 1.

poses, for the event was not certainly known—1690 years before the Christian era (Chron. d'Herodote, cap. p. 131).

The prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, who flourished for 600 to 700 years before our era, represent Tyre at those periods as our Macaulays, McCullocks, and Allisons, now expatiate on the unequalled greatness, and commerce, and wealth of London, as a city of unrivalled trade and opulence, whose "merchants were princes, and her traffickers the honourable of the earth." And lo! all that remains of the greatness, and the commerce, and the riches, and the merchant princes, and the honourable of the earth, who were the traffickers of Phœnicia, is a miserable hamlet, with a few squalid rayahs and wretched Arabs for its inhabitants.

I have visited many wrecks and ruins of ancient capitals, pitiful remains of former renowned cities that were in their time of prosperity great emporiums of trade; vast cities, in fact, that at one period absorbed the commerce of the then known world, and there were gloom and desolation, squalor and penury there in abundance; but nowhere have I felt the overwhelming influence of depression, of this kind of decay and death of all power, activity, movement, and prosperity, so much as at Sour, the squalid representative of her ancient Tyre with all her ships, colonies, and commerce; better far encamp amidst the ruins of Tamor or Thebes, where no human being is to be seen, where there is no interruption to the solemn silence of the place, and where the stillness of death has something of a sacred composure in it, than to be reminded of the awful change that has come over the place and its people by such remnants of humanity as the miserable hovels of Sour send forth to startle the traveller who wanders over the site of ancient Tyre.

"In ancient times Sidon underwent no small share of the vicissitudes incidental to Syrian cities of importance.

"In 1629 the last act of barbarity towards unoffending Sidon (we are told by Chasseaud in his History of the Druses), was perpetrated by the Egyptian Mamelukes under the order of the then Sultan of Egypt, who to the end that it might no more afford

a shelter to or a favourite resort of Christians, caused Sidon to be destroyed; and the pretty gardens and dwelling houses were laid waste by the hands of the ruthless Egyptian soldiers or razed to the ground with fire. Few cities lay claim to greater antiquity than Sidon; it is supposed to have been founded by Sidon, the eldest son of Canaan, and if this be the case, it is now nigh four thousand years old. A Phœnician colony afterwards existed at Sidon.

From this date Sidon fell successively under Saracen, Seljukian, Turkish and Egyptian Sultans, till at the date above recorded, five hundred and sixty-five years ago, the last act of spoliation was committed; and in 1841 Sidon, in common with Syria and Palestine, again fell under the sway of the Ottoman empire, after having been ruled by Ibraham Pasha for a few brief years.

"Sidon is now computed to contain upwards of twelve thousand inhabitants, two-thirds of which are Mohammedans, the rest Christians and Jews; the Christians being by far the most numerous of the two. They still continue to be a very industrious people, excelling in the manufacture of silk scarfs and gaily ornamented *boshias*, a species of wide handkerchiefs bound round the caps of the men, partly to protect their heads from the sun, and partly for ornament's sake.

"Beirout and Sidon may be said to be the sea-port towns of the country of the Druses."

Arnold in his "Lectures on History," justly observes, that the physical geography of a country exercises a vast influence over the destiny of its inhabitants.

There is no country in the world more peculiar in respect to its physical geography than Syria, and especially that southern part of it which includes Palestine. The observation of Arnold applies to the whole region of Syria from north to south, from its northern frontier, the line from the Gulf of Alexandretta, eastward to the Euphrates, and along the Mediterranean, Beirout, Sidon, and Tyre, and the Lebanon range eastward of them, then

from Mount Carmel to Ascalon, within which parallels Palestine is included.

In a popular modern work by a reverend professor of Oxford, that treats of Syria—"Sinai and Palestine in connexion with their history." By the Rev. A. N. Stanley A.B. Canon of Canterbury (8vo. London, 1856), we find the singular features of the physical geography of Syria pointed out and their conformity strikingly exhibited, with the character of the people principally concerned in its history, and the destiny of those separated from surrounding nations and preserved from them till the time appointed for their deliverance.

"In Palestine (says Mr. Stanley), as in Greece, every traveller is struck with the smallness of the territory. He is surprised, even after all that he has heard, at passing, in one long day from the capital of Judea to that of Samaria or of seeing within eight hours three such spots as the Hebron, Bethlehem, and Jerusalem. The breadth of the country from the Jordan to the sea is rarely more than fifty miles. Its length from Dan to Beersheba is about a hundred and eighty miles. So that the main breadth of Palestine from east to west is estimated at 50 miles, and its length from north to south 180 miles.

"The time is now gone by when the grandeur of a country is measured by its size, or the diminutive extent of an illustrious people otherwise than enhance the magnitude of what they have done."

The contrast between the littleness of Palestine and the vast extent of the Empires which hung upon its northern and southern extremities is rarely absent from the mind of the Prophets and Psalmists. It helps them to exalt their sense of the favour of God, towards their land by magnifying their little hills, and dry torrent-beds into an equality with the giant hills of Lebanon, and Herman, and the sea like rivers of Mesopotamia. It also fosters the consciousness that they were not always to be restrained within these earthly barriers. "This place is too straight for me: give me place where I may

dwell." Nor is it only the smallness but the narrowness of the territory which is remarkable. From almost every high point of the country its whole breadth is visible, from the long wall of the Moab Hills on the east to the Mediterranean on the west.*

Here we find the physical geography of a country fitted as it were for a nation secluded and set apart by Providence from the rest of the world.

Between the people of Israel in the Holy Land and the great empires of Assyria and Babylon, which rose on the plains of Mesopotamia, the cities of the Euphrates, and the Tigris, the rulers and corruptors in their days of pride and prosperity of all the kingdoms then known in the world: the Eastern wilderness intervened. The wandering tribes of the desert, the Nomade, Turcomans, and Bedouins, hung on the eastern frontier of the Holy Land. And on the southern frontier, they and the desert of Arabia interposed between Palestine and Egypt. The western boundary of the Holy Land was the Mediterranean.

Palestine was like an oasis in the wilderness, in the midst of plunderers indeed, but secured by her mountain barriers from the predatory hordes of the desert.

The whole geological structure of Palestine is limestone, with a few exceptions in the valley of the Jordan. The rocky character of the whole country has its bearings on historical events.

"As a general rule," says Professor Stanley, "Palestine is not only a mountainous country, but a mass of mountains rising from a level on the sea-coast on the west, and from a level desert on the east, only cut asunder by the valley of the Jordan from north to south, and at the valley of Jezreel from east to west. The result of this peculiarity is, that not merely the hill tops but the valleys and the plains of the interior of Palestine, both east and west, are themselves so high above the level of the sea as to partake of all the main characteristics of mountainous districts and scenery."†

* "Sinai and Palestine," by the Rev. A. B. Stanley, p. 114.

† Professor Stanley, "Sinai and Palestine," p. 126.

Jerusalem is 2,200 feet above the level of the sea.

Bethlehem	2,500	,,	,,
Mount of Olives	2,396	,,	,,
Hebron	2,800	,,	,,

Lebanon is the birthplace of the four rivers of Judea and Phœnicia, of Antioch and Damascus; of these, the Orontes, the river of the Greek kingdom of Antioch and Seleucia is of most celebrity in history.

The Litany, or the "Syrian River," is the Leontes of modern geography, a name perhaps erroneously given to it. The Barada is the ancient Abana or Pharpar of the Old Testament.

This region of the Lebanon was the border land of sacred and common history, "the scene of the oldest traditions and civilizations of the world." According to Professor Stanley, "the meeting point of all the religions of western Asia."

The ancient city of Ephron the Hittite, the first home of Abraham and the Patriarchs in Syria, Hebron was the nearest seat of civilized life, not only of Judah but of Palestine.

Of the Jordan with its manifold peculiarities, that river which throughout the length of Palestine, "the artery of the whole country is unique on the surface of the globe," Mr. Stanley observes:—"The ranges are remarkable of the Lebanon, the courses of the Orantes, the Leontes, and the Barada (the Pharpar of the Old Testament, the river of the Syrian kingdom of Damascus) are curious, but the deep depression of the Jordan has absolutely no parallel.

"No other valley in the world presents such extraordinary physical features, none has been the subject of such various theories as to its origin and character. How far this strange conformation of the Holy Land has had any extensive influence on its history may be doubtful. But it is perhaps worth observing at the outset, that we are in a country, of which the geography and the history, each claims to be singular of its kind:—the history, by its own records, unconscious, if one may so say, of the physical peculiarity, the geography, of the discoveries of modern science, wholly without

regard, perhaps even indifferent or hostile, to the claims of the history. Such a coincidence may be accidental; but at least it serves to awaken the curiosity, and strike the imagination; at least, it lends dignity to the country, where the earth and the man are thus alike objects of wonder and investigation.

It is around and along this deep fissure that the hills of western and eastern Palestine spring up, forming the link between the high group of Lebanon on the north, and the high group of Sinai on the south: forming the mountain-bridge, or isthmus, between the ocean of the Assyrian desert, and the ocean (as it seemed to the ancient world) of the Mediterranean, or "Great Sea," of the west.*

An anonymous writer, whom I know to be a Protestant clergyman, in a publication of no slight merit, entitled "Some Strictures upon that Portion of 'Sinai and Palestine,' by the Rev. A. P. Stanley ("By a Recent Traveller There" Lon. 1857,) makes the following very just and valuable observations, applicable indeed to statements put forth by nine-tenths of our modern travellers in Syria.

"The Oxford Professor (the Rev. A. P. Stanley) appears ever anxious to impress upon his readers his opinion of the superiority of Western Christianity—that portion of it which, we presume, he would term Protestant—over that form of doctrine and practise which obtains in the east. This is not only remarkable in the work under notice, but likewise peeps out of the author's introductory professional lecture delivered in the University. Perhaps Utah and the Mormon colony, that most consistent of all sects, claiming and exercising the right of private judgment, and most protesting of all Protestants, was not present to his mind when Professor Stanley wrote of our holy religion the words—'Which has attained its full dimensions only in proportion as it has travelled farther from its original source'—or—'as rising in the east, yet finding its

* "Sinai and Palestine," by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, M.A. p. 111. London, 1856.

highest degree of development and fulfilment in the west" (pp. 155, 456). The question involved in these quotations is too large for discussion in this place. To these, however, together with the assertion that 'Christianity has no home on earth, least of all in its own birthplace,' we can only state our non-adhesion, believing them, as we do, to arise from an un-Catholic and Sectarian spirit, and from a narrow and bigoted system, which, unable to sympathise with anything in a Sister Church that accords not to its peculiar Shibboleth; a system and a spirit which predeterminately objects to everything in doctrine and discipline not fashioned to its own meagre form; and which ends in a depreciation of Christ's holy Church in the east, and in an Anti-Christian admiration of the followers of the false prophet of Mecca."

For these words of a high principled Christian philosophy, full of wisdom and charity, and evidential of a tolerant spirit, enlightened, enlarged, and improved by travel, every intelligent Christian reader, whatever may be his creed, will feel grateful.

The different races of Syria, or rather, the mixture of different nations settled in that country, may be divided into three classes:—

1. The descendants of the people conquered by the Arabs—namely, the Greeks of the Lower Empire.

2. The descendants of the Saracen conquerors.

3. The descendants of the Turcoman tribes, settled in Syria, during the period of the Seljukian domination, and the present rulers, the Ottoman Turks.

With respect to the Greeks and Arabs, Volney sub-divides them thus:—

"Firstly—The Greeks who are called Orthodox, and who are separated from the Roman Catholic Church.

Secondly—Latin Greeks, re-united to that communion.

Thirdly—Maronites, or Greeks of the sect of the Monk Maron, formerly independent of the two communions, but at present united to the latter.

"The Arabs must be divided into:

"Firstly—The proper descendants of the conquerors, who have greatly intermixed their blood, and are considerably the most numerous.

"Secondly—The Metoualis, distinguished from these by their religious opinions.

"Thirdly—The Druses, distinct likewise from the same reason.

"Fourthly—The Ansarians, who are also descended from the Arabs.

"To these people, who are the cultivators and settled inhabitants of Syria, must still be added three other wandering or pastoral tribes, viz., the Turkomen, the Kurds, and the Bedouin Arabs.

"Such are the different races dispersed over the country, between the sea and the desert, from Gaza to Alexandretta.

"In this enumeration it is remarkable that the ancient inhabitants have no remaining representative; their distinguishing character is lost and confounded in that of the Greeks, who in fact, by a continued residence from the days of Alexander, have had sufficient time entirely to take place of the ancient people; the country alone, and a few traits of manners and customs, preserve the vestiges of distant ages."*

"The general language of Syria is the Arabic tongue. M. Niebuhr reports, upon hearsay, that the Syriac is still used in some villages of the mountains; but though I interrogated, on this subject, several monks, who are perfectly well acquainted with the country, I have not been able to learn anything like it. I have been told only, that in the towns of Maloula and Sidnaia, near Damascus, they speak a dialect so corrupted, that it is difficult to be understood. But this difficulty proves nothing, since in Syria, as in all Arabian countries, the dialects vary at every place. The Syriac may be, therefore, regarded as a dead language; for the Maronites, who have preserved it in their liturgy, and in their mass, understand very little of it, while

* Volney, "Travels in Syria and Egypt." Ed. 8vo. 1788. vol. i. p. 222.

they recite them. We may assert the same of the Greek. Among the monks and schismatic priests, there are very few who have any knowledge of it, unless they have made it their particular study, in the islands of the Archipelago; besides, we know that the modern Greek is so corrupted, that it would no more enable a man to understand Demosthenes, than the Italian to read Cicero. The Turkish language is only used in Syria by the military, persons in office, and the Turkoman hordes. Some of the natives learn it, as the Turks learn Arabic, to facilitate their dealings with strangers; but the pronunciation and accent of these two languages, have so little analogy, that they always continue foreign to each other."*

The descendants of the various races of the inhabitants of Syria with few exceptions, are dispersed over the country. The Greeks, especially those of the orthodox community. The Turks and Arabs are scattered over all the provinces. The Turks, however, reside only in towns where they hold some military or civil employment, or are engaged in commerce. The Arabs as well as the Greeks inhabit the villages, and are the peasants of the country in all agricultural localities, and are the industrious labouring poor of the larger towns.

The Greeks of the Roman Catholic Church, far less numerous than the so called orthodox Greeks are chiefly settled in towns where they carry on various small trading and handicraft occupations.

The Maronites are one of the exceptions I have above referred to, they are concentrated in particular localities, and have a national sort of existence. Formerly they occupied exclusively the country between the summit of the Lebanon to the Mediterranean, from the Nahr-el-Kelb, to the Nahr-bar. This was their chief locality in the time of Volney, but changes have taken place in these settlements which will be noticed in the more ample details, that will be given of the different classes. The Druses at the time above referred to, from 1783 to 1785

* Volney's Travels in Syria and Egypt, p. 226.

occupied the country bordering on that of the Maronites, and extended from Nahr-el-Kelb, to the vicinity of Tyre.

Of this sect details will be found in a separate chapter.

The *Metoualis* are followers of Aly, son-in-law of Mohammed. They reject his three predecessors in the Khalafite, and affirm that he alone is the lawful Imâm, and that supreme authority, in things temporal and spiritual, belongs to him and his descendants. They reject the *Sonna*, or traditional law, and are, therefore, regarded as heretics by other Moslems. They number about 25,000. Nearly one-half of them occupy Beled Besharah, on the southern border of the Druse country; and there, seventy-five years ago, in one of the periodical Druse persecutions of Christians, one or two of their Sheikhs afforded an asylum to the fleeing Christians, though others took part in the Druse massacres. A more powerful section of them resided in villages of Anti-Lebanon, near Baalbek, and were ruled by the noble family of Harfûsh. The Harfûsh Emirs have for ages been the pest of the country. Hitherto they had been the deadly enemies of both the Druses and the government; but recently they joined both Turks and Druses in the plunder and burning of the Christian town of Zahleh!

The Metouali's formerly occupied the valley of Bekaa, near the sea coast of Tyre, but they have undergone great changes and misfortunes that have reduced their numbers considerably, and the limits of the locality they occupied within the last century.

The Ansayrii occupy the mountainous district from Tripoli to Attakia, and from Nahr-akkar to the latter town under different denominations, or rather known by various nicknames, and particular designations given to their different secret sects; such as the Kelbia, Kadmousia, the Ihamsia, &c.

The Turcomans, Kurds, and Bedouin Arabs, have no fixed places of abode, or pasture for their herds and flocks; they follow in Syria and on its confines the same nomade lives which their cognate tribes do in other regions.

The Turcomans, however, are mostly met with in the vicinity

of Antioch, the Kurds in the wilds adjacent to Alexandretta, the Bedouins wander over the whole frontiers of Syria.

Dr. Thompson, a missionary in Syria and Palestine for the past twenty-five years, in a recent work, entitled "The Land and the Book," illustrative of the Holy Land, published in 1860, gives the following estimate of the numbers of the different Syrian races and sects:—

"Syria has always been cursed with a multiplicity of tribes and religions, which split up the country into small principalities and conflicting classes, the fruitful parent of civil war, anarchy, and all confusion. Nor has this source of mischief been materially mitigated down to the present hour. This will appear but too evident from the following statistics:—

The Moslems, who are the ruling class all over the country, except in Lebanon, may number about	800,000
They are divided into two principal sects—the Sunites and Shiïtes. There may be 50,000 Kurds	50,000
The Nusairîyeh occupy the mountains north of Tripoli, and may amount to	150,000
The Ismailîyeh and Yezzîdy are too few to merit specific attention; and the same may be said of the Nowar, or gipsies, who are found in all parts. They will not amount to more than .	20,000
The Druses occupy the southern half of Lebanon, extend over to Hermon, and out into the Hauran—a few thousands reside in Jebel el 'Alah, west of Aleppo, and on Carmel, and the mountains above Acre. They number about . .	100,000
The Jews are about 25,000. In Jerusalem, 7,000; in Damascus, 5,000; Aleppo, 4,000; Safed, 2,000; Tiberias, 1,500; Hebron, 600; and the remainder in Beirût, Sidon, &c., &c. . .	25,000
The Maronites, chiefly of Lebanon, may be . .	200,000
The orthodox Greeks, in all parts of the country .	150,000

Armenians, 20,000; Jacobites, 15,000 . . . 35,000
There are Papal offshoots from these sects, which may number 70,000 or 80,000 . . . 80,000

"There are a few Latins in most of the large cities, and also Protestants in various parts.

"This gives a total of 1,610,000; which, of course, is only as close an approximation as the very imperfect statistics of the government, and of the different sects enable us to make."

Ubicini and Viquesnel estimate the population of Syria at two millions and a half, thus distributed:—

Mussulmans	1,200,000
Maronites, and Roman Catholics of all sects	350,000
Orthodox Greeks	400,000
Jews	150,000
Druses	300,000
Metoualis, Yezides, Ansareeyz, and other sects	100,000
Total	2,500,000

In the second volume of M. Ubicini's work, published in 1854, he makes some important alterations in his previous estimate of the Latin Roman Catholic Rayah populations of the Turkish Empire. But it must be admitted by the most ardent admirers of M. Ubicini's "Lettres sur la Turquie," that once he entered on subjects which the archives of the different departments of the Turkish government could not enlighten him upon, his value as a Turkish historian was at an end, and most certain it is that on the subject of the Roman Catholic populations throughout the Turkish Empire, he was very scantily, or rather, very ill informed. For instance, in the first volume of his Letters, he states that the numbers in the Latin church, under the Patriarch in Jerusalem, throughout the Turkish Empire amounted to 640,000. But in the second volume he states that he inadvertently had comprised in this item 100,000

Franks, members of the Roman Catholic church, citizens of foreign Christian states, resident in the Turkish dominions, and scattered throughout the Turkish Empire. And previously, in the same volume, he had to state that he had made a mistake, and in the account he had given of the Roman Catholic Rayahs had omitted to include 35,000 United Armenians of the Roman Catholic community.

The Christian population of the several communities of all sects believing in Christ, and that of the Jewish people subject to Turkish rule—the Rayahs of the Ottoman Empire, according to the latest estimates, amount to about ten millions. They constitute nearly a third part of the population of the Turkish Empire.

They are divided into five communities, governed by their respective patriarchs, and the Israelites by the grand Rabbi of the Jews.

In the first volume of M. Ubicini's "Lettres sur la Turquie," published in 1854, the estimate of the total Latin Roman Catholic population, in the Turkish Empire, is set down at 940,000.

But, rectifying the errors of Ubicini, and availing myself of other sources of authentic information, the following estimate of the Roman Catholic population of the Turkish Empire may be laid before my readers as the most reliable that can be arrived at.

By that estimate the Roman Catholic Rayah population in the Turkish Empire would in reality amount to 804,000, thus distributed:—

Latins under their Patriarch . .	540,000
Maronites ditto of Latin church . .	140,000
United Armenians ditto . . .	35,000
United Greeks and Melkites ditto .	55,000
United Chaldeans ditto . . .	25,000
United Syrians ditto	9,000
Total . . .	804,000

And if we add to this number the amount of the Frank population of Roman Catholic subjects of France, Austria, and the Italian States, resident in the Turkish Empire, estimated by Ubicini at 100,000, the total number would be of Roman Catholic Rayahs, and Franks in Turkey, 904,000.

At present, everyone of the different Christian sects in Constantinople is under the control of a head, by whom the whole number is represented, and who can exercise, in particular cases, both civil and criminal jurisdiction. They keep registers of births, and some of them can pronounce a divorce between man and wife, but none of them can decide in cases of litigation concerning patrimony. The patriarch of the Greek Church is styled "Your Holiness," and in the four patriarchates he has eighty-six metropolitans; independently of him are the four archbishoprics of Cyprus, Litidsha, Scarpatho, and Mazzovo. The Armenian Church owns four different patriarchs,—the principal at Constantinople, the others at Sis, Achtamar, and Jerusalem. These have altogether seventy bishops under them. And the Catholic Armenian Christians have their patriarch at Constantinople; he governs the Syrian and Nestorian branches of his church, and has twenty-two dioceses under him. The Roman Catholic Church is likewise represented and governed by its patriarch, who has under him three archbishops, as many metropolitans, besides pontiffs, bishops, and priests. Besides this, all foreigners who are Catholics, but who have become subjects of the Porte, have their own officers to superintend their civil affairs; since 1850, when they were first recognised, the Protestants have been allowed their own representative. And finally, the Jews have in Constantinople their high priest, with seven Arch-Rabbis, and ten Rabbis; this sect numbers from 150,000 to 170,000.

The Latin community (in the Turkish division of Rayahs), strictly speaking, consisted of all Roman Catholic Rayahs, who were subject to the Porte, under the jurisdiction of the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, whose See in that city was re-established in 1847, by a concordat with the Pope.

The Latin Patriarch's jurisdiction is exercised in different parts

of the empire by sixteen delegates, or apostolic vicars, some of whom are archbishops, and ten are bishops.

Most of the Latin archbishops and bishops receive annual grants, from the funds of the "Societé pour la Propagation de la Foi." The archbishop of Constantinople receives from 30 to 35,000 francs annually for himself and his clerical establishment, and has also a fixed income from France.

The Latin Catholics of Constantinople have eight churches in Pera and Galata. These churches and their establishments of clergy, of France, Italy, and the Greek Islands, are by special treaty placed under the protection of France and Austria.

The condition of the Latins is generally more prosperous than that of other Rayahs, Christian, and Jewish, and consequently they are regarded with jealousy by the other Rayahs, and especially by the Greeks, who seek every opportunity of attacking them and injuring them. In Constantinople they employ all their influence to bring the loyalty of the Latins into bad odour, to thwart the measures of the Vakeel of the Latins, a delegate appointed by the Porte, and assisted by a permanent council of four dervishes, who represent the Roman Catholic community at the Porte, regulates Kharadji imposts, receives their complaints, and lays them before the Government. The protectorate functions of the Vakeel, however, are more nominal than real advantages to the Roman Catholic Rayahs, especially in the provinces.

In Syria the Catholics never think of having recourse to this functionary in their troubles and grievances, they seek redress generally through the medium of their Emir, or directly from the Pachas, and other minor authorities of the chief towns of their several districts.

In the provinces the Greeks bring their great numerical superiority and weight with the authorities to bear on their mortal enemies, the Latins, and in the minor Courts, and divans of Pachas and Mudirs in the Medjis and municipal Councils they contrive to harass and oppress their Catholic adversaries very effectually, and most frequently, with full impunity.

In 1852, M. Ubicini states, the Greek bishop of Scio prohibited all the orthodox Greeks, the faithful of his diocese, from holding any intercourse, or commercial relations with the Roman Catholics of the Island, and none of his flock daring to disobey the interdict, many of the Catholic families were ruined in consequence, and compelled to quit their country.

The leaning of the Turkish Government to the Greek community, M. Ubicini states, is too apparent. However, in the case of the Greek Bishop of Scio an act of tardy justice was done by the Porte, on the promulgation of a second interdict, which occasioned the loss of a considerable portion of the crops, and of the taxes, the people were called on in vain to pay. The conduct of the Greek Bishop of Scio and his promoters was condemned by the Porte.

On the suppression of the Jesuits, Pope Pius the 6th, confided the Roman Catholic mission in the Turkish empire to the order of the Lazarists of St. Vincent's rule, whose head quarters have been at Constantinople since 1776.

The missionaries of this order have establishments throughout the Levant. The Latins have neither churches, schools, nor hospitals of their own in Turkey. At Constantinople, Salonica, Smyrna, and Beirout, they use the churches and schools, founded, or maintained by the Lazarist missionaries. In Alexandria they use those of the Franciscan order, as well as those of the Lazarists. To the protection and liberty of the French Government the Lazarists are chiefly indebted for the advantages they possess in the Levant. During the last twenty years the Jesuits have settled and commenced small establishments in some parts of the Lebanon, which other missionaries had not penetrated, in virtue of the protection accorded to the Roman Catholic Rayahs, and exemption procured for them from some oppressive imposts to which other Rayahs are subject, through the influence and interference of Roman Catholic Embassies in Constantinople.

It has been stated in several Roman Catholic journals in

the months of October and November, 1860, that vast numbers of the Bulgarian community professing the tenets of "the orthodox Greek Church" have come over to the Roman Catholic religion, or manifested their decided purpose so to do, in the event of their national hierarchy and liturgy being recognized by the Pope. I have read in some journals of four millions of Bulgarians having on these terms proposed re-union with the Church of Rome. The latest and best informed statistical writer on the subjects relating to the Ottoman Empire, M. Ubicini, estimates the number of the Bulgarian community at three millions. When we have further reduced the number of persons of this community who have manifested a desire to be re-united with the Church of Rome, to as many thousands as there are really millions belonging to the Bulgarian community, we shall perhaps be nearer the mark.

A very able and well-informed writer on the Roman Catholic religion, Mr. Wilberforce, in his observations on this subject says:—"The different Christian races who live under the Turkish yoke regard one another with detestation, to the solidity of which the feeling of Celts against Saxons in Ireland is a mere shadow. One effect of this hatred is a constant endeavour of each people to get rid of all interference of its neighbours with its ecclesiastical concerns. The same jealousy is not felt against the French, who are the recognised representatives of Catholicity in the East, nor against the Russians, and the Christians of Turkey are happy to make use of either of those powers to free them from the detested yoke of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople. Thus in 1848 the Sclaves and Roumans of Transylvania took the opportunity of the revolutionary movements in Europe to deliver themselves of that yoke, and now the Bulgarians, who have been for years at open war with the Phanariote clergy, and have been demanding Bishops and priests of their own race, and a national Patriarchate, are on the point of separating themselves from the old centre of schism. The Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, who well knew their object, have long refused to ordain for them any Bishops

or Priests not of Greek origin, and the quarrel has at length come to a head.

"In this the Bulgarians are only obeying a tendency which is more or less in operation in all the Christian nations of the Turkish Empire. The Bosnians, Moldavians, Wallachians, and Servians, are all progressing towards separation from Byzantium. New Rome is being treated as she served old Rome, and her rebellious children are simply imitating her own conduct. The whole Patriarchate of Constantinople is in a state of disintegration; and this fact evidently increases the gravity of the Bulgarian movement, which may, as our French Correspondent says, be only the example which the other Eastern Christians will make haste to follow.

"But this feeling will not account for the submission to Rome. The tendency of the Bulgarians was always supposed to be towards independence, and a Patriarchate of their own. But since the Crimean war, a new influence has penetrated the East; sympathy with France has sprung up both in Russia, and the Sclavonic, Roumanic, and Bulgarian provinces of the Turkish Empire. They wish, as of old, to preserve and strengthen their national demarcations; but they wish also to inoculate their nationalities with the French spirit. This friendly feeling towards France tends to make the Oriental Christians look favourably on all that constitutes French life, and to remove their contempt for the Latin religion. Perhaps the Syrian expedition has strengthened this view, and made the Christianity of the East recognise in France something more than a mere example and model—a powerful friend, and zealous protector.

"To these three feelings, intense nationality, detestation of the Greeks, and simple faith in France, we may add an historical tradition, as constituting the chief causes of the present movement nearly a thousand years ago. In 866, Boris, King of the Bulgarians, sent his long hair to St. Nicholas I, as a sign of his submission to St. Peter and his successor. His idea comprised an ecclesiastical independence of Constantinople,

the establishment of a special Patriarchate for Bulgaria, and the attainment of Papal protection for the foundation of a new Catholic empire in Eastern Europe. Boris had preluded his conversation with a copious effusion of blood; and Rome, suspicious of his character, acted with great deliberation. Four years afterwards 870, Byzantine Priests won him back to Constantinople. In after years the Bulgarians were again united to the Church, but their return served only to set their inconstancy in a fresh light, and to prove the small amount of judgment which presided over their conduct.

"The movement of reconciliation is only beginning, and may be easily checked either by political or religious misunderstandings; we have not been without the most pregnant examples of such miscarriages within the reign of the present Pope. When Monsignor Ferrieri was sent to the Sultan to announce the accession of Pius IX., a deputation from the Armenian Consistory presented to him a formula of their faith, and demanded on this basis to be admitted to Catholic Communion. The formula was completely orthodox, but the movement failed through the demand of Monsignor Ferrieri that the nomination of the Patriarchs and the Bishops should be in the hands of the congregation of the Propaganda. About the same time a magnificent opportunity for the re-union of the Copts to the Church was spoiled by the interference of the English Consul at Cairo. France, which is usually supposed to be the protector of Catholic interests in the East, took no interest in this movement, and found no means to counteract the machinations of the British agent. Either of these causes may easily upset everything in the matter of the Bulgarians; the Bulgarians, in common with other Orientals, have an especial hatred for the Roman congregations; and if they fancied that they were to be subjected to the Propaganda, or, the congregation for the revision of Oriental liturgies, instead of to the Pope in Consistory, they would be likely to fly off at a tangent. Doubtless, also, the whole political influence of the English interest with the Porte will be brought to bear on the re-unionists; and it will require

both honesty and energy on the part of France to countermine Protestant intrigue. Perhaps Napoleon the III. may see in this, as he saw in the Syrian expedition, a means of calming the outraged feelings of the French Catholics, and of reconciling them in some measure to his Italian perfidies; we cannot suppose that any other motive but self-interest could force the ally of Victor Immanuel to undertake the cause of Catholicism in the East. Still it *is* the recognised idea of France to adopt this character.

"The movement, as we said, is only beginning as yet; the declaration has been signed by one Bishop and his clergy, and about 2,000 laymen; about one hundred villages have also given in their adhesion to the plan; the declaration was concerted with the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, and has been placed in his hands for transmission to the Holy Father. The following is a summary of its contents:—

"First; the Bulgarians commemorate their conversion by SS. Cyril and Methodius, who left them a national hierarchy, in communion with Rome; the Greek Patriarchs of Constantinople criminally dispossessed them of these rights; the Bulgarians could do nothing but protest; but now the measures of the present Sultan, who has proclaimed liberty of conscience, allows them to make a more energetic protest against the violence which imperils their morals, shuts them off from all intellectual development, and delivers them over to the tyranny of a foreign and 'antichristian' priesthoood. Burning with the desire to preserve their ancient faith, the Bulgarians have determined to break with the Greek Patriarchs, and to re-unite their Bishop at Constantinople to the Holy See.

"After this preamble they recognise as holy the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and promise a full and sincere fidelity to the Pope and his successors, and their apostolic delegates. They, however, feel sure that Rome will allow their rites and liturgies to remain intact, and beg the Pope to recognise their distinct and national hierarchy as canonical.

"Finally, they humbly beg the Pope to invite the French

Emperor to intervene with the Sultan on their behalf, that the independence of their hierarchy may be recognised, and that they may be protected from all intrigues whether of the Greeks or others. And they beg the French government to give them the same protection which it gives to other Catholic nations of the Ottoman Empire.

Such is this movement, which, may result in the wholesale reconciliation of 4,000,000 Christians to the Holy See. Nothing can be further from our thoughts than to disparage the importance of the fact; our only idea is, to point out the mixture of motives which actuates the chief movers, and to hint that as their motives are not simply religious, not simply spiritual, many a side wind may blow them out of their course."

The Latin Greeks and Melkites of the Latin church in the Turkish Empire, amount to 55,000. The Melkites are the Roman Catholic Greeks of Syria, where their race was predominant up to the time of the Saracen conquest. It was only under the Pontificate of Clement XI. they were recognised as a Catholic community in union with the Roman Church, and certain immunities were then granted to them. About one half their number inhabit Mount Lebanon, where they have three monasteries.

They were governed by a Patriarch, who resides in Damascus, and is likewise titular of Antioch and Alexandria, and has nine suffrages under his jurisdiction, bishops of Aleppo, Beirout, Sour (Tyre), Sarda (Sidon), St. John d'Acre, Bosra, Zabeli, Balbek, and Damascus. Their ritual is in the Arabic tongue, and according to the Greek ritual.

The Chaldeans in union with the Church of Rome, amount to about 25,000. They are not to be confounded with the Kurds. Ubicini ascribes their origin to the ancient warlike race of mountaineers established in Central Asia, who peopled the cities of Assyria and Babylon. A fragment of the Chaldean nations subverted by the Persians, was converted to Christianity, it is said, by St. Thomas and St. Thaddeus, and resisted the persecution of the Sabean idolators, till the beginning of

the 5th century, when the heresy of Nestorias penetrated amongst them. The portion of them who remained faithful to the Latin Church preserve the name of Chaldeans. They dwell principally in the city and surrounding plains of Moussoul. Their patriarch resides in Moussoul. The Chaldean Roman Catholic Church is governed by him, and seven suffragan Bishops. Their common language is Arabic. Their national dialect is taught in the schools; it is nearly the same as the Syriac, differing mainly from it in pronunciation, and the written characters of the alphabet.

The Syrian community, in union with the Roman Catholic Church, is of the same origin as the Chaldean, as the language will testify, though some difference exists, ascribable to more intercourse of the Syrians with Greeks and Romans, than the Chaldeans. The heresy of Monophysitism crept into the Syrian Roman Catholic community in the 6th century, and still maintains its ground.

Its followers, well known in Arabia in the time of the Caliphs, named Jacabites, are still a numerous sect, exceeding in number those in communion with the Church of Rome; the former are estimated at 64,000, the latter at 9,000. The patriarch of the United Syrians formerly resided on Mount Lebanon, but the present titular, a prelate exercising the functions of patriarch, has transferred his residence to Aleppo, to be nearer the followers of his church. He has eight bishops under his jurisdiction.

The Maronites in communion with the Church of Rome, are of Syrian origin. They derive their name from a holy man of great fame for sanctity, named Maro, or Maroun.

A distinct account of the Maronites will be found in a succeeding chapter.

THE JEWS.

The Jewish community of the Turkish Empire are estimated by Ubicini, at 150,000. They probably amount at the present time to 175,000. They reside chiefly in cities and towns, in the

principal trading ports of the Levant, and are engaged chiefly in the business of brokers, money changers, and in retail traffic in the bazaars. They are by no means opulent as a community, nor so actively engaged in commercial pursuits as the Greeks and Armenians. They are divided in the Levant into two sects, the Rabbinists, and the Karaites, and are quite as inimical to each other as those of the Greek and Latin churches.

In the 16th century they occupied many posts of importance and confidence in Constantinople under the government, and in the several embassies and consulates, as secretaries and interpreters, and in commercial and monetary establishments of an extensive kind, as agents, factors, and foreign correspondents. They were then renowned for their learning, and intellectual culture, as their ancestors had been in Spain; and were particularly skilled in the Eastern languages. But progress was not congenial to them, and in the active competition of the Fanareot Greeks, and the Armenians with them, they allowed themselves to be beaten down and supplanted, and ever since their decline, have degenerated more and more.

The affairs of the Jewish community are the best regulated, however, of any of the rayahs of the Turkish Empire. They are more charitable, perhaps than any other community, so far as the exercise of benevolence goes in their own population.

Apostacy amongst them exists only in the fertile imaginations of enthusiastic missionaries in the Levant, and the credulous minds of good, easy men in comfortable circumstances, and pious old women in distant lands, addicted to the reading of Missionary reports.

As an element of resistance to Turkish rule that can ever become formidable to it, the Jewish population of Turkey can hardly be taken into account.

The Jews of the Levant have no sympathies with Russia, and to the Christian populations of Turkey they have the most mortal antipathies.

It is at least, for those who take an interest in Ethnographical researches, a subject for the most profound reflection,

that while the fragments of Christian populations, scattered throughout the Turkish Empire, after four hundred years and upwards, of persecution and spoliation, still count in their several communities, many hundreds of thousands of members; the fragment of that Jewish population of Palestine, which at the commencement of our era, amounted to some millions, is now comprised in the scanty numbers of one hundred and fifty or seventy thousand.

It is a very curious circumstance, that two hundred and twenty-five years ago, the Jews obtained from Sultan Selim II. in 1576, the privilege of having two printing presses, one at Constantinople, the other at Salonica. But unfortunately the issues from the Israelitish press, were calculated to benefit only their own community. Copies of the Hebrew Scriptures were multiplied in the east, and several commentaries on the *Torah*, the five Books of Moses, were published, and some Jewish literary disquisitions on subjects within the limits of the little Hebrew literary and religious Goshen of their community, were printed. A short lived impetus was given under the reign of Selim II. to the literature and philosophy of the Jews. But it did not last; not a trace of this tincture of learning and science of the Jews in 1576 is to be found in the Jewish community in any part of the Turkish Empire in 1860.

In its stead a kind of philosophy prevails which is overlaid with rabbinical learning.

Opulent Jews frequently leave large sums of money for the foundation of schools and libraries, for the education of poor students, and the religious instruction of their community at large, but the study of the Tealmud and its commentators is alone promoted by these foundations, and I never could ascertain that mere secular instruction derived any advantage from them beyond facilities for learning to read and write, and to attain a grammatical knowledge of the Hebrew tongue. But let it be always borne in mind, that no people ever suffered such undeviating persecutions as the Jews have done in Christian countries, and that the unhappy fugitives

from them constitute the present communities of Jews in the Levant, into whose minds feelings of isolation, and sentiments of attachment to their religion and its law has been burned by Christian oppression and intolerance.

Sale has made an astounding observation with respect to the proselytizing powers of Protestantism, and the glorious destiny reserved for their exercise, namely, the conversion of Mohammedans.

"The writers of the Romish communion (says Sale), in particular, are so far from having done any service in their refutations of Mohammedanism, that by endeavouring to defend their idolatry, and other superstitions, they have rather contributed to the increase of that aversion which the Mohammedans in general have to the Christian Religion, and given them great advantages in the dispute. The Protestants alone are able to attack the Koran with success, and for them, I trust, Providence has reserved the glory of its overthrow."*

This is a very curious observation coming from a man of high intelligence, from an Oriental scholar, a zealous champion of Mohammed, an apologist of the law of Islam; and obviously a person more of a German rationalist in his religious opinions than a member of the Church of England. One of the rules he lays down for Protestantism in its future mission for the conversion of Mohammedans, is—"To avoid teaching doctrines against common sense; the Mohammedans not being such fools, whatever we may think of them, as to be gained over in this case."

He observes, moreover, it is not dogmas, Protestantism must think of teaching the Moslems; but it must "bring them over to the ancient and primitive faith."

Sale possessed, in an eminent degree, the art of concealing his religious sentiments, and seeming to express opinions that were in vogue in his day with those for whom he wrote. Like other philosophers who soar above sects, and strike out from old

* Sale's Koran, Preliminary Observations.

systems and established religious principles, but are afraid of their efforts to rise or advance being too closely observed, curiously considered, and ultimately known, and who make the profane vulgar only partially acquainted with the thoughts, aims, and ends, at which they drive; Sale often deemed it necessary to mystify his sentiments, to take certain formulas from orthodox Protestant writers, supply them with some new words, that overlaid the sense, and adopt them apparently as they originally were, pure and simple expressions of sound Protestant opinion.

Let it be observed how Moslems are to be converted to Christianity, on Sale's showing; it is not dogmas they are to be taught, but they are to be brought over to the ancient primitive faith.

How are they to be made acquainted with the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, if no dogmas are to be taught? Is the ancient primitive faith a religion independent of those fundamental truths or doctrines? But what grounds had Sale for believing Protestantism was destined to overthrow the Koran? All enlightened Protestants know a great missionary spirit does not belong to it. All the efforts of English missionary societies have not been able to endow it with that spirit in foreign lands. Upwards of one hundred and twenty years have transpired since Sale published his translation of the Koran. How many Moslems have been converted in that period? I have known intimately the Protestant missionaries, both English and American, in Turkey, Syria, and Egypt, and was closely acquainted with the labours, and the results of the efforts, of those zealous and estimable persons, for four years; and all my experience would lead me to the conclusion, that their mission, as far as the Moslems are concerned, have been utter failures; and that any success that has attended their labours, with respect to the Jews and Christians of those countries, has been confined to the most worthless, abject, venal and degraded of both these religious communities.

That was my experience, and the result of all my enquiries from 1824 to 1828. It was my experience in 1840, and again in 1860.

But Sale's opinion, with respect to the power of Protestantism to overthrow the Koran, has been frequently appealed to, and it has been acted on extensively, especially in Syria. It has been adopted by missionaries, by English travellers, and *by English Consuls.* Nay, it has become a part of the duty of English Consuls to act on that opinion, to write despatches in relation to it; to carry on an everlasting war of intrigue, and interference on behalf of the affairs of Protestant missionaries, and against the labours of Roman Catholic priests and prelates, and the influence of France and Russia in regard to the custody of the holy places, or the protection of Christian Rayahs of the Greek or Maronite churches.

This new polemical policy, with the cares of which English consular authorities in Syria are now charged, is the means of keeping up a spirit of petty, underhand hostility, a system of mean, prying, eavesdropping hostility between the consuls of the different nations.

This pseudo religious policy of ours in the Levant, of keeping up consular contentions "for an idea" is exceedingly injurious to British interests. And the worst of it is, the injury is done them for an absurd idea; for the promotion of objects which are not successful—of Protestant proselytism in the East.

The destiny has not been ordained for it that Sale and his followers imagine. Another, and a very different mission, has been given to it, or taken on itself—the promotion of the civilization that is the result of commerce and agriculture, carried to the highest pitch of perfection, the attainment of wealth, the conglomeration of it in a few hands, the acquisition of vast territories and political advantages.

Sale is not contented that England should have these benefits—he claims for Protestantism, power which is not in it.

The rivalries and contentions of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Missionaries, especially since the expulsion of the Egyptian forces under Ibrahim Pacha, and the unfortunate removal of the Emir Bechir from the government of the Lebanon,

whose Druse and Maronite population he ruled with a strong hand, but with great advantage to both for a great many years, had especially since 1840 involved the different consulates, but especially the French and English, in the polemic controversies carried on between the missionaries of both countries; and, in fact, rendered the consuls of both nations less political and diplomatique agents of their governments, than servants and partizans of Bible societies and missionary institutions.

Van de Velde, in his work on Syria and Palestine, vol. i. p. 132, referring to missionary labours in 1851 and 1852, gives a curious account of the method of converting the Christians and Jews of Syria to "true Christianity," on the part of English and American missionaries. It is to be borne in mind that M. Van de Velde is an enthusiastic champion of those missionary labours, and looks confidently to their success in Protestantizing the East.

He says in 1842 the English missionaries "sent a colporteur from Beirout with tracts to Hâsbeiya, and it was from this man that the people first learned to attach to the term Protestant the meaning it bears among them, 'a true Christian.'"

But the good effects expected from this pioneer of true Christianity and his pack of tracts, were rendered abortive by the Greek priests. The *Colporteur* had no sooner scattered his tracts and taken his departure than the Greek priests, "found means, in their hatred of *the Gospel*, to get possession of the *Books* and burn them." So here it ekes out that the *Colporteur* was not only the bearer of tracts, but Bibles.

This mode of stealthily scattering the Gospel and the glad tidings of salvation contained in the tracts of "the true Christians," is worthy of attention. Good Mr. Van de Velde says:—

"It was about this time that the Emir imposed certain new taxes, which caused great dissatisfaction. These taxes fell particularly hard upon the poor, who had no protector, and the thought occurred to them, 'We may possibly find protection from the missionaries, they are merciful men.' In this hope

forty-five of them went to the brethren at Beirout, to enrol themselves as Protestants under their protection.

"The missionaries did not of course interfere with regard to the tax, but they 'expounded to them the way of God more perfectly;' showing them at the same time how much true faith in the Son of God differs from such nominal Protestantism as has its origin in mere secular motives. The brethren then sent them back to Hâsbeiya, with Bibles and tracts, promising to give them spiritual help, if their future conduct should attest the sincerity of their wishes. Shortly after, the missionaries found an opportunity of sending two native preachers to Hâsbeiya, who had, in a few days, a hundred and fifty people in attendance on them, desirous of receiving instruction. This was too much for the priests. The Bishop threatened to excommunicate all who should adopt the Protestant heresies; but seeing that this threat had no effect, he had recourse to that powerful weapon, by which in the East justice and right are so constantly assailed.

"The head of the Greeks of Hâsbeiya is the Patriarch of Damascus, a certain Mathôdios, who is also the Emir of Hâsbeiya, and is subject to the Pacha of Damascus. The Bishop of Hâsbeiya had no difficulty, though his superior in Damascus, in purchasing from the Pasha an order to the Emir, to the effect that the heretics should be brought back by force to the Greek Church. The Emir obeyed but too willingly. The new converts had to endure the bitterest persecutions. They were pelted with stones, and spat upon in the bazaars; they were beaten and insulted in their houses as well as in the public places; they were no longer safe anywhere, and were debarred all social intercourse. Many attempts were made even upon their lives; and so severe was the persecution to which they were exposed, that at one time, all but three, who remained faithful, drew back; but around those three forty others soon gathered. After consultation, they agreed that it was best to disperse; and quitted Hâsbeiya to take up their residence at Abeyh, or elsewhere in Lebanon. In this attempt, however, they failed; the

means of earning their bread were wanting; and after a few months, they were compelled to return to Hâsbeiya. Then arose, in the silent night, from their closed dwellings, many a heartfelt and united prayer to the Lord of the Church; eagerly and trustfully His promises were sought out from His Holy Word; and, like the phœnix rising from the flames, the youthful Christian congregation lifted its head anew. Persecution had no longer any terrors for them. At the request of the Patriarch the Emir ordered his janissaries to drive them with scourges to the Church; but his wrath was unable to compel them to kiss, or worship the images. A certain Choîil-Chouri, himself the son of a priest, but now converted to Christ, was sent by his family to Constantinople; here by the help of the Armenian brethren, he obtained a firman from the Sultan, granting freedom to the Protestants of Hâsbeiya. Some amelioration in their lot was the happy result, but only to a certain degree, for the artful Mathôdios managed, during five weary years to bribe the Pacha of Damascus to assail them with all kinds of secret, social persecutions.

"Thus hath the Saviour planted here a vineyard for Himself, 'which He doth keep, which He watereth every morning, which he keepeth night and day lest any hurt it.' * * *

"I asked Mr. Thomson what could be the reason that the noble Syrian plain should be so utterly deserted and untilled, and received the following reply:—This country is government property; if anyone rents it—for buy he cannot—there comes the tax-gatherer, to decide how much he can produce, and the tenant is charged with a fifth of the estimated crop. Unless the tenant bribe this functionary he is sure in ordinary circumstances to be rated at much above what the land can afford to pay. The consequence is, that people avoid as much as possible renting land from the government; or, if anyone venture to sow and reap, he instantly hurries off with his crop, before the tax gatherers can interfere to prevent him.'

"'But,' said I, 'how comes the government to own so much land?'

"'In various ways. Often through the confiscation of the landed property of those, who, for some cause or other, have been found obnoxious, to the penalties of the law. On the occurrence, too, of small local insurrections, which are not uncommon. Thus, for example, the noble valley of Aytûn had belonged, for sixty years past, to the Emir of Hâsbeiya. But the Pasha of Akka, having revolted from his lawful sovereign the Sultan, he made himself master of several parts of the country, and among others, of the district of Hâsbeiya. The Merj Ajûn next fell into his hands. The Sultan sent troops against the rebel Pasha; the Emir of Hâsbeiya was restored to his independence; but as all the land that the Pasha had appropriated was confiscated, the Merj Ajun became the property of the crown. Ibrahim Pasha, the Egyptian general, afterwards conquered Syria, and the Merj Ajun became a possession of his. Syria passed again out of his hands into those of the Sultan, yet the soil of that fertile tract only exchanged one iniquitous master for another. And so, when the population had no other resource but that of renting from this oppressive government the ground which they must cultivate in order to procure a livelihood, they are compelled to abandon such districts. I have seen,' said Mr. Thomson, 'whole villages depopulated in this manner.'

"My breast glowed with indignation at the thought of the iniquity and oppression with which this poor people are trodden down. How comes it that slavery in the far west should fill the hearts of the nations with sympathy, while they forget this other slavery in the East—a slavery beneath which, in another form, whole millions are sighing? How is it that England should submit to so many immense sacrifices in loosing the bonds of heathen slaves in America, and yet protects the Sultan of Turkey, and makes every effort to maintain the independence of the Turkish Empire, without paying the least regard to the blood and tears of its Christian subjects? Not a book do we find written on Palestine that does not lament over the violence of its oppressors. The country had one short breathing time

lately, and that was when Mohammed Ali wrested it from the Sultan's grasp. Yet it was England, raised as she has been to be the first among nations, and called by God to vindicate the cause of the oppressed, that, in 1840—41, subdued Syria and Palestine for the Sultan."*

PROTESTANTS IN TURKEY.

"During a long period the only Protestants in Turkey (says Ubicini) were the Europeans residing in the different cities and trading ports of the Levant; it is only since 1831, that we find English and American missionaries flocking to Constantinople and other parts of Turkey, for the purpose of making Protestant converts, with the aid of the Bible Society. Their efforts have had but partial success; and although the correspondence and reports of different societies speak (but indefinitely) of the "increasing number of proselytes," it does not appear that the results have been commensurate with the zeal manifested, or the great sacrifices incurred. This want of success has not been occasioned by any obstacles raised by the Porte (the Ottoman Government, immoveable in its apathy, as in its principles of toleration, having left the field entirely open), but is rather to be found in the fact that Protestantism, with its rigid and severe forms, has little chance of success by its own attractions in the East, where above all things an appeal should be made to the eyes and the imagination. Thus we find that within twelve or thirteen years from the time of their first appearance in Turkey, the Protestant missionaries had made but very few converts. The missionaries, perceiving this, without abandoning the conversion of the Jews (which was the object to which they had almost exclusively devoted themselves), began to turn their attention to the Christian subjects of the Porte, and particularly to the Armenians, who seemed to be more vulnerable than the rest.'

"We accordingly find, that subsequent to the above men-

* Narrative of a Journey through Syria and Palestine, by Mr. C. W. M. Van de Velde. Vol. i. pp. 132, 197.

tioned date, the Protestant missionaries maintained a constant intercourse with various Armenian families, and that many members of this community assiduously frequented the Protestant churches on Sundays and festivals. After 1845, the number of Armenians who had thus *de facto* broken through their allegiance to the church was so considerable, that not only the patriarch, Monsignore Matthew, thought himself called upon to exercise a stricter surveillance over his flock, but that Russia *(in quality of protectress of orthodoxy and even of non-orthodoxy in the East) took alarm*, and addressed energetic remonstrances to the Porte through the medium of her ambassador. She instigated the Greek Patriarch to fulminate an interdict against the new dissenters, and even to obtain certain repressive measures against them, which were conceded by the weakness of the Porte; and which, exaggerated by public rumour, soon assumed the appearance of a persecution, and called forth the intervention of the representatives of the two great Protestant Powers at Constantinople—England and America. 'From this moment,' says an English writer, whose unfair treatment of myself, personally, I shall abstain from imitating, 'there began a series of persecutions in the metropolis and principalities of the empire. The converts were everywhere cited before the episcopal synods, and every means tried to compel them to abjure their new creed. Of those who refused some were delivered up to the Turkish authorities, and incarcerated: others, fettered as maniacs, were sent to an Armenian madhouse; some, again, were exiled to distant provinces, and exposed to misery and privations of all kinds. The victims naturally laid complaints before the two Protestant ambassadors, who, thereupon addressed serious remonstrances to the Porte, but the credit of Sir Stratford Canning himself was forced to yield to the influence of the Armenian bankers, secretly instigated by Russia.'

"The natural consequences ensued. These rigorous measures only served to aggravate the evil they were intended to repress, and hastened, instead of retarding the crisis.

"At the beginning of 1846, several hundred Armenians in Constantinople and the provinces, and chiefly in that of Nicomedia, openly embraced Protestantism. A priest named Vartanès, whose character was afterwards called in question, was one of the number. The patriarch, more and more alarmed, and anxious to strengthen the bonds which held his flock to their allegiance, caused a sentence of excommunication to be published in all the parishes of the capital against the new sectarians, enjoining the faithful, under the most terrible threats, to break off all relations with them. 'Whoever,' says the excommunication, 'has among them a son or a brother who has joined the dissenters, and gives him bread, or treats him as a friend, must be made aware that he is nourishing in his house a venomous viper, whose mortal poison will one day destroy him. Such a one gives bread to Judas; such a one is the enemy of the holy Christian faith, a destroyer of the Armenian Church, and an opprobrium to all the nation. Cursed are all the houses and shops of these heretics. We shall inquire respecting those who shall remain in connection with them, and shall mark them out to the Church by terrible anathema.'

"The violence of this document, accompanied by threats, roused the religious passions of the Armenians, and induced them to raise the report of a new persecution, against which report the Patriarch entered a protest in the 'Journal de Constantinople,' April 5th, 1840.

"The Porte, however, foreseeing that there would be no security for the Armenian Protestants so long as the Patriarch retained any civil authority over them, and urged, also, by the remonstrances of England and the United States, resolved to release them from their obedience to their chief, and caused them to be inscribed in the registers of the ihticab-aghassi (superintendent of consolidated duties) for the payment of taxes; recommending them at the same time, by a circular of the Grand Vizier, to the protection of the provincial governors. Four years after the adoption of this measure, which, though it remedied present abuses, gave no security for the future, the

Sultan conceded the complete emancipation of the Protestant Rayahs, permitting them to be recognised as a distinct national body, like the Latins (November, 1850) and to be represented at the Porte by a civil chief of their own. Since this time the Porte has constantly extended to the Protestants all the advantages and privileges enjoyed by other Rayah communities, and confirmed them specially by the firman of the 6th of June, 1853.

"The number of Protestants in Turkey, according to the highest estimate does not exceed two thousand; nearly all belonging to the Armenian nation. They are divided into ten small communities or parishes, three of which are at Constantinople and in the suburbs, and the seven others at Broussa, Ismid, Adabazar, Merzefan, Trebizond, Erzeroum, and Aïntab.

"A small body of Protestants reside at Jerusalem, under the pastoral care of the Prussian Bishop Gobat. The Prussian-Anglican See of Jerusalem was established in 1841, by the exertions of the Anglo-Prussian mission, sent to Palestine for the special object of converting the Jews. Four years after (September, 1845) a firman was obtained to authorise the erection of a Protestant church at Jerusalem. This church, which is unfortunately too large for the limited number of its congregation, was built on the ruins of Herod's palace. Attached to it are a school and a hospital for the use of the converts.

"According to the Statistics of M. Boré, the Protestant community in 1848, under the care of Bishop Gobat, did not include more than forty-two persons; from which it would appear that the success of the missionaries has not hitherto been in proportion to their efforts.

"'But in this country,' observes M. Fairun, 'whether in Syria or Palestine, it will be ever thus with Protestantism. The Anglican mission at Jerusalem, and that established by the Americans in the village of Abéih, on the heights of Lebanon, not far from Beirout, reap but bitter fruits. Man and nature, faith and tradition, are alike hostile to their undertaking. Jews,

Greeks, Christians, Latins, and Turks, all unite for the moment in a sentiment of antagonism.' The comparative inconsiderable success of the Protestant missions, in contrast with the unremitting progress of Catholicism, is thus explained by M. Boré, from the accounts of the missionaries themselves.

"'On arriving at a city or a town, the first thing they do is to visit the bazaars, and other public places, offering for sale at a low price copies of the Bible and New Testament, translated into the dialect of the country. In default of purchasers, who are generally very rare, they leave about the sacred volumes in the most conspicuous spots, hoping they will attract attention and readers, and that the good seed thus scattered abroad may spring up and bear abundant fruit, as if the mere possession of printed copies of the scriptures would make converts of ignorant Arabs, Turks, or Kurds. But even if all these people were able to read, and very few can do so, the translations made for their use are generally too imperfect and faulty to be intelligible to the multitude; and so it often happens, that instead of the happy results the missionaries anticipated, they have the mortification, in the course of a day or two, of finding the only traces of their labours in a few torn and scattered fragments of the sacred volumes trampled under foot in the public streets. The Romish missionaries adopt a different course. They begin by making themselves a part of the population whom they seek to convert, adopting their language and habits, and assimilating themselves in all respects as nearly as possible to the inhabitants of the country. Through heat and through cold they toil on foot over the most savage regions; nor are they ever seen mounted on the backs of mules, accompanied by wives and children, and encumbered by a camp equipage, tents, mattrasses, and all the conveniences of life, like the train of a Pacha travelling to take possession of his government.'

"I am glad to place, side by side with this testimony, which, coming from a Roman Catholic may be suspected of partiality, that of Mr. Slade, an English naval officer, and a Protestant: 'The Protestant missions,' says he, 'are much vaunted; doubt-

less they cost large sums, but the good they do is as a drop in the ocean, compared to the good works of the Roman Catholic Church, silently and modestly performed, in all parts of Turkey.'

"The Catholic missionaries are permanently established, and labour like apostles, in countries which their competitors only visit, or travel through, more after the fashion of gentlemen tourists than missionaries devoted to another world. The difference in the results of their respective labours is thus plainly accounted for."*

The Protestant institution in Jerusalem, under the auspices of the Prussian Bishop, Gobat, and the Protestant Pastor, Valentiner, in 1852 was thus composed, we are informed by M. Van de Velde, in his "Narrative of a Journey through Syria and Palestine," published in 1854, vol. ii. p. 288:—

German Protestants	14
German Roman Catholics	2
Italian Roman Catholics	3
Arab Protestants	10
Arab Greeks	9
Russian Greek	1
Arab Latins	10
Jews	8
Proselytes	12
Coptic Christians	4
Mohammedans	5
Total	78

Of these, forty-six were men, and thirty-two women.

* "Letters on Turkey," by M. Ubicini, Appendix, Vol. ii.

CHAPTER II.

Syria under Mohammed Ali.

THE acquisition of Syria was not solely suggested to Mohammed Ali at the time he attempted it, by the general state of domestic affairs in Turkey; for he had not only long before been exerting all his influence with the Porte to obtain the Pachalik of Acre, in addition to his other governments, but he had for several years been laying measures for rendering it subservient to his ultimate designs and frontier policy. Abdallah Pacha, a young man of weak understanding, had succeeded Sulieman Pacha in the government of Acre, and having been instigated by his vanity, and by Mohammed Ali, as he affirmed, to seek the annexation of Damascus to his Pachalik, he forged a firman from the Porte, and ordered the Emir Beshir (who was subject to him as chief of the Christian and Druze provinces of Lebanon) to make a levy of mountaineers, and march against Damascus.

The Emir did so, and advancing to the gates of Damascus, burnt the village of Mezzy, which was near them. This rebellion having been denounced by the Porte, and the Pachas of Aleppo, Tripoli, Damascus and Cæsarea, having united their forces to repress it, the Emir fled, and abandoning Syria, took refuge with Mohammed Ali, while Abdallah Pacha shut himself up within the walls of Acre, where, well supplied with provisions and the means of defence, he sustained a ten months' siege.

In the meantime Mohammed Ali advocated the cause of Abdallah and the Emir at the Porte; the siege seemed hopeless, the affairs of Greece claimed immediate attention—and bribery in aid of all these considerations, prevailed. Abdallah Pacha and the Emir Beshir were pardoned, and restored to their governments, and Mohammed Ali regarded his policy as triumphant, and the interests of his protegées bound up with his interests.

Mohammed Ali, at this juncture, when the power of the Porte was almost paralysed, thought the time was come for the invasion of Syria. Large detachments of Bedouin Arabs crossed the desert from Egypt, and Ibrahim Pacha, with an Egyptian squadron, anchored off Jaffa in February, 1831.

The chiefs of the different races of Syria remained for some time undecided as to the course which they should take, and looked with no small interest to the steps that would be taken by the Emir Beshir. This wily chief, with the caution and astuteness peculiar to the Syrian race, sought to preserve a neutral position in the approaching conflict. He assembled a council of the principal Emirs and Sheikhs of Lebanon, at which it was resolved that no hostile measure should be taken until it should be known what were the sentiments of the Porte.

The Emir Beshir was at length reluctantly obliged to visit Ibrahim Pacha at the camp before Acre; though he still endeavoured to avoid compromising himself, and came down from the mountains attended only by some of his household, and with a present of a few sheep and horses for Ibrahim and Abbas Pacha (Mohammed Ali's grandson), hoping thus to give to his presence a character of mere personal attention to Ibrahim, whose father had been at one time, his benefactor.

Ibrahim, however, having once in his power the Emir's person, that hostage became a security for the conduct of his provinces (left by him under the government of his son, Emir Ameen); nor was he, after a residence of some months at the camp, permitted to return to Ihteddeen, until Ibrahim felt as-

sured of his co-operation, and still further secured it by retaining with him his grandson, the Emir Mahmoud, and compelling the Emir to compromise himself by acting from the camp in his own name, as the Pacha's delegate over all the newly acquired towns wrested from the Sultan upon the coast.

At the conclusion of an eight months' siege, Acre was surrendered, and a rapid march through Syria, putting to the rout the armies of irregular troops opposed to him at Homs and Bylau, brought Ibrahim for the first time, into serious conflict with the Turkish army at Thonia, under the Grand Vizier, in December, 1832. The battle lasted several hours, when the Grand Vizier having been taken prisoner, the Egyptian army prevailed.

Russia alone, of all the European governments, appeared to have prepared for the consequences of this Egyptian invasion of Syria, and the decided position she then took, turned the tide of Egyptian affairs, and gave Russia the commanding influence she lately enjoyed in Turkey.

The negociation and settlement of Kutich succeeded, in 1833. Ibrahim Pacha entered within the limits of the defiles of Adana, and Syria, at a tribute of 6,000 purses annually, and that province was placed under the government of Mohammed Ali.

The conduct of the Egyptian army, on its march through Syria towards Constantinople, was most exemplary for discipline and orderly behaviour towards the people. The professions of Mohammed Ali breathed every design that could promote the welfare of the country; and though he was not sufficiently rigid in many of his opinions to please the more orthodox classes, his power was regarded by all as irresistible, and all were disposed to believe that his administration of affairs in Syria would be favourable to the people.

Europe regarded Ibrahim Pacha with increased consideration. England, ere yet its ambassador had reached the Porte, advanced beyond her colleagues in compliment to the rising

power; and while Ibrahim Pacha was still on his rebellious march to Constantinople, and Russia had withdrawn her Consul General from Egypt, she sent one permanently to reside there, who was invested, for the first time, with a diplomatic character, and an office which was designated with the political distinction of "a mission." Had the Pacha of Egypt at that time adopted the government of Syria, and sought to identify the welfare of an enlightened system for the people with his administration, his position would have been considerably strengthened, and the good wishes of Europe secured for the maintenance of his power.

Ibrahim Pacha was not insensible to these views. Disagreements, however, often arose between him and his father in Egypt, from whom the chief instructions of administration issued, and Ibrahim finally withdrew from any ostensible participation in the civil affairs of Syria.

The Egyptian administration in Syria proceeded consequently upon the same monopolising and infatuated spirit of selfish despotism which had governed Egypt, and wretchedness, rapaciousness, and depopulation, spread in a short time throughout all its provinces of Syria.

The first measure of the Egyptian government in Syria, we are told by Consul Farren, was to introduce a new personal tax, called *Ferdè*, on all the males of the country, from the ages of twelve and fourteen. It was first fixed at sums from fifteen to five hundred piastres, according to the supposed means of the individual. The tax was indiscriminately applied to all classes, and was paid by the Christians in addition to the *Karatch*, or poll tax, to which they had long before been subject—the rest of the population had not been liable to any taxes of a personal nature. The great sources of the public revenue were the *Miri*, or land tax, which varied exceedingly in its rate, but was chargeable in fixed sums; and the *Grallee*, or grain contribution, payable in some cases as a tax, and in others as a ground rent. The fiscal duties were, under the former government, collected in general by its own

agents, but Mohammed Ali invariably farmed them to private speculators. They entered, however, into the public accounts under the head of Mal Miri, or revenue property.

These taxes, which, under Turkish government, had all been most irregularly paid, and were ill levied, and diminished in their progress to the treasury, were not only fully enforced by the Pacha of Egypt, and the chargeable amounts rigidly investigated, but permanent additions were made, where any circumstances of local advantage, or existing comparative prosperity in a district might offer a pretext.

Thus, allowing for all the extortions of government, and local oppression, under the old system, there was a direct increase of fifty per cent. in the regular taxation, and the new impositions of *Ferdè* by Mohammed Ali, amounted alone to nearly one-half of the whole regular taxes formerly levied. It was the same in the other political divisions of Acre and Aleppo, where the former payed 13,000 purses *ferdè*, and the latter 7,000. The substitution of the rule of Mohammed Ali for that of the Sultan, was ruinous to Syria.

The Egyptian system of extortion was more permanent, general, systematic, and extensive, and more impoverishing and irresistible than that which it had superseded.

The government was annually the purchaser of large quantities of grain and of fodder, timber, and oil, &c., for its service. The sale was compulsory, and the quantity was levied, in certain proportions, on the different districts of the province, and the price regulated by the Divan at the beginning of the crops, always favourable to the government. The corn purchased by the government was not paid for at the time, but ran up in account with the taxes. It was not taken from the peasant, as it would be by other purchasers (who paid the market price), nor was it measured according to custom; but the government only received it so sifted and measured as to make a difference of ten per cent. in the quantity, and the villagers were then obliged to convey it, at their own expense, to the government granaries at Damascus, Acre, and the chief magazines, though, in some

cases at two or three days' distance. Besides this, the quantity required was not regulated by the actual wants of the public service, but for speculative purposes of the government; and as grain almost invariably in that country rises twenty, and sometimes to fifty per cent., and higher in price, before the new crop came in, the surplus was sold at that time by government, for its own advantage, though not then perhaps all paid for, to the villagers, and a competition is thus established in every way disadvantageous to the farmers. . . .

A continued requisition has been made on the country for the baggage and marches of the troops from one part to another. On their arrival from, or departure to, Egypt—on their marches into winter quarters, or summer stations—on their concentration at different times, on the northern frontier—during their operations against disaffected parts of the country—and for the transport of provisions, timber, and materials for the government service.

The greatest blow, however, given by Ibrahim Pacha, to the sentiments of the people, and to Egyptian interests, was the forced conscription.

The forced conscription, at different times, has amounted to 35,000 men, or upwards of eleven per cent. on the male population,—a most destructive drain on the industry, population, and productive power of the country. The periods of the forced levies were kept secret, and generally commenced on a Friday; when the mosques were resorted to. At the hour of prayer numerous parties of soldiers were distributed through the quarters of the cities, and intelligence was conveyed to them by the firing of a gun, of the moment to commence. They then rushed on all the citizens who might be in the streets, and drove them to the great square of the Serai, when, having left them in its enclosure, they returned to make fresh captives of all upon their routes. A short time sufficed to spread a thrill of fear and despair throughout the city. Women might be seen rushing wildly through the streets, followed by their children, to seek their husband, son, or father, who but a

few hours before had left them to provide for their daily wants, and now are separated, perhaps for ever from their families, without a parting benediction, or alleviating care or solace for their destitution. . . .

In many cases the fathers and near relations of those supposed to be hid, have been publicly beaten, to extort a disclosure of their retreats; and some have died of the wounds thus received. These scenes were not confined to the cities, but spread through all the villages and hamlets of the country. At Damascus the soldiers were ordered out in the dead of the night, and suddenly fell upon the neighbouring villages, and seized the peasantry while sleeping in their houses. The fields and plough were forsaken at such a time, agriculture, trade, and commerce were neglected; the shopkeepers, peasants, and artizans fled to the hills; and anxiety pervaded the entire country. Whole villages were suddenly abandoned, except by the women.

In this manner upwards of 35,000 of the population have been seized and yoked to a career of rebellion, and the best interests of the country, and the strongest ties of humanity have been sacrificed. . . .

It is not only for the measure itself, but for the total regardlessness of all solicitude for the public sentiment and interest in its enforcement, that the Egyptian government is so deeply reprehensible. Towards the close of 1837, and just after the *ferdè* and land taxes had been enforced, and the country strained to the utmost to discharge them, when the crops had failed, the price of grain had risen nearly 300 per cent., or to twelve piastres the miol—and the winter was beginning to set in with extraordinary severity, and famine and misery seemed before the people—at that very time, not only was the additional requisition for grain rigidly enforced, but scarcely had the old crops been off the ground when orders were given for a general levy of 5,000 men throughout Syria, and the land was suddenly abandoned, the peasants fled in all directions, and the country

was plunged again into a degree of despair, which burst out in that revolt in the Hauran which gave so much trouble to Ibrahim Pacha, and in which so many of his troops and generals had been slain.*

* "The Present State and Prospects of Syria," by John W. Farren, Esq., late British Consul at Damascus. See Lord Lindsay's Travels, vol. ii. p. 233. et seq.

CHAPTER III.

The Greek Rayah Community of the so called "Orthodox Church."—Constitution of the Greek Church in Russia and Turkey.—The Proposed Re-Union of the Greek and Latin Churches.

FULLER states in his "Historie of the Holy Warre, the great schism originated in the time of Pope Gregory the Great, about two years before his death, A. D. 604, that proved an incurable breach between the Eastern and Western Churches." "It originated in the act of John, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who claimed to be universall bishop—Gregory the Great stoutly withstood him." Matthew Paris ascribes this act of John, the Patriarch, to a Greek prelate of an earlier date, to a Greek archbishop going to Rome to obtain the customary confirmation of his new dignity, but the fees that were demanded of him having appeared so exorbitant that he objected to the payment, and returned to his own country inveighing loudly and bitterly against the charges he deemed exorbitant. Meetings of ecclesiastics and murmurings followed, and as the minds of men became more excited by these complaints, parties became more exasperated, and at length war was declared between the churches.

The Greek Church, separated from the Roman Catholic, is divided into three distinct communions:

1. The Græco-Russian, styled "the Orthodox Church."

2. The Chaldean or Nestorian Church, the Patriarch of which formerly resided in Kurdistan, but since 1846 has dwelt at Aurmiah, on the borders of Persia and Turkey.

3. The Constantinople Patriarchal Church, with which all believers in the Orthodox Greek faith in the Ottoman Empire, some parts of Greece, and of the Austrian dominions, and the Danubian provinces are in communion.

The schism of the Greek and Latin Churches, as Gibbon remarks, followed close upon the restoration of the Western Empire by Charlemagne. Originating in the antipathy which the subjects of the old and new Rome had felt for each other, ever since the time of Constantine, this schism began in the ninth century, through the ambitious intrigues of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and was consummated by his successor, Michael Cerulerius, in 1054. It has continued down to the present day, and engenders between the partisans of the two churches an animosity, unabated by the progress of the human mind, during a period of eight centuries.

It is not my intention to enter into all the details of this long dispute. It is known that Photius took for the motive or rather the pretext of this rupture with Rome, the addition of the words "*Filio-que*" to the Nicene creed. The torch of discord between the Eastern and Western Churches had already been lighted by the agitation of the following questions, the solution of which was thought to involve grave doctrinal consequences—"Does the Holy Ghost proceed from the Father only, or from the Father and the Son?" Many councils, and especially that of Florence, in 1439, attempted to reconcile the dissidents. The latter council was specially convened with a view to the re-union of the Greek and Latin Churches. It was attended by the Greek Emperor, John Palæologus, and Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople. The result of this council was the re-union *on paper* of the two churches.

The *Act of Union*, pronounced at the close of this council, and afterwards subscribed by the Pope, the Emperor, and their principal adherents, created only a momentary concord, all traces of which speedily disappeared. Popular fanaticism proved more powerful than the policy of the Emperors or the dread of the Turks. Greek priests were in the habit of purifying altars

at which a Latin priest had officiated; fanatical monks were incessant in their denunciations of the union, and in preaching the extermination of those they termed schismatics; and the patriarchs themselves, in their writings, excited the people against the latter. These imprudent proceedings were, in a great degree, the cause of the fall of the Empire.

Can it, however, be asserted—it is asked by St. Thomas of Aquinas—that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity were deeply affected by this controversy? True it is that the Orthodox Eastern Church agrees with the Catholic Church, in recognising in Jesus Christ two natures and one person, and in holding that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; but she rejects the addition of the article "Filioque," introduced by the second Œcumenical Council. She refuses to believe in purgatory, and does not absolutely proclaim the eternity of punishment. These are the only essential points involving schism; other subjects in dispute—such as the worship of images, ecclesiastical supremacy, diversity of liturgies and language, the celibacy of the clergy, the mode of administering baptism, the Eucharist, &c., affect merely the rites and internal discipline of the church.

The schism of the Nestorian Church, introduced by Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 428, is also based upon two essential differences; its followers holding that there are two natures and two persons in Jesus Christ, and that the Holy Ghost does not proceed from the Son.

The Eutychian Church, on the contrary, founded on the doctrine of the Archimandrite Eutychès, and condemned by the council of Chalcedon, in 451, acknowledges in Jesus Christ *but one nature and one person;* whence the name of *Monophysite.* This doctrine was introduced into Egypt by Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and was thenceforth propagated among the Copts and Abyssinians.

The total number in all countries of the schismatics of the Eastern Church, may be estimated at 71,000,000: 64,000,000 of which are orthodox, 6,500,000 Monophysites, and 40,000

Nestorians. Of this number rather more than 13,000,000 belong to the Ottoman Empire; viz., 10,000,000 Orthodox, and 3,000,000 Monophysites; of the latter 2,375,000 are Armenians, and 65,000 Jacobites*

From a passage in the Turko-Grecia History we find that at the close of the sixteenth century, the Patriarch of Constantinople exercised his jurisdiction over all Christians of the Oriental rite. He was recognised as the sole Œcumenic by the three Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who nevertheless gave him the title of brother and colleague. He controlled the Churches of Asia Minor, of Greece, of the islands of the Ægean Sea, of the two Mœsias, of the trans-Danubian regions, and even those of Russia.

This Christian Church, with its great community and majority of Christian Rajahs of the Turkish Empire, is termed by its members the Orthodox Church, and by Roman Catholics the Schismatic Greek Church.

At the period of the downfall of Constantinople and of the Greek Empire, many immunities and privileges were conferred on it by the Turkish conqueror, Mohammed II., several of which still remain in force. The church establishment, as it was then constituted, remains still pretty much the same. A Patriarch was recognised as head and Archbishop of Constantinople, having jurisdiction, not only in ecclesiastical affairs, but in civil matters connected with marriage contracts, divorces, legacies, and testaments, and also with those of correctional police of minor importance in his diocese.

The Patriarch was elected by a senate, over which he presided by right. The senate was composed originally of all prelates residing in Constantinople. Its attributes were those of a legislative authority, those of the Patriarch of an executive administration in ecclesiastical affairs. The synod administered the revenues of the Church, and watched over the interests of the Greek community in general, whose members contributed

* Ubicini "Letters on Turkey," vol. ii. p. 118.

to the expenses of the synod, and also to the maintenance of the Patriarchs: the latter likewise derived a considerable income from fees paid by prelates on their installation, from a tax on causes tried before its tribunal, and a yearly contribution from every head of a family, and priests officiating in his diocese, and in the enforcement of his rights the Turkish authorities were bound to assist him.

Every prelate enjoyed in his diocese the prerogatives of the Patriarch at Constantinople, except in these particulars, that an appeal lay from his decisions, in cases of gravity, to the Patriarch, and that all orders emanating from the latter were binding on him. The clergy in their establishments in the provinces, were maintained by fees paid by those who had recourse to ecclesiastical tribunals, by the product of the sale of ecclesiastical functions, and by free offerings in the churches twice a year at episcopal visitations.

The secular officiating ecclesiastics were called the superior clergy; the monks, or caloyeroi, who inhabited the innumerable monasteries scattered over the empire, were called the inferior order of the Greek clergy. The several communities of the Greek church had local magistrates elected by them, of very limited and humble functions, namely, to apportion the capitation tax, to control other contributions, and to provide for their collection. These magistrates have been very pompously designated Municipal Institutions.

The Russian Orthodox Greek Church has had several Russian historians. One of the most recent and enlightened is a Monsieur Mouravieff, chamberlain of the late Emperor Nicholas, and a high functionary of "the most holy governing synod of St. Petersburg," in 1838. This work, translated by the Rev. Mr. Blackmore, was published in London in 1842.

We learn from this author that the old Russian capital of Kieff was the cradle of Muscovite Christianity. Its introduction dates from A.D. 866, to A.D. 1015. Kieff was the seat of the Metropolitan See from 1072 to 1240.

After the Tartar invasion it was removed to Vladimir, and continued there from 1250 to 1308.

It was again removed to the second capital of the empire, Moscow, and there remained from 1328 to 1582.

Job, the first Patriarch of the Orthodox Greek Church, of Russia was appointed in A.D. 1587.

Up to 1690 there has been ten Patriarchs; the last, elected in that year, was Adrian.

The next appointment of a head of the Church, but with minor attributes than the preceding pontiffs, was made in 1701; this functionary was designated the Guardian of the Patriarchate.

Twenty years later a new form of government was given to the Orthodox Russian Church by the Emperor, with the sanction of the dignitaries of the Church reluctantly accorded, or rather wrested from them by the Czar Peter. This new State Church Government, designated "The Most Holy Synod," was instituted in 1721.

The Russian Church, in common with the other Orthodox Greek Churches, claims the Apostle St. Andrew for its founder, who is said to have first planted the cross on the summit of one of the hills of Kieff, the spot on which the ancient capital of Muscovy subsequently rose. But it was not till nine centuries later that the light of Christianity beamed upon Russia from the city of Byzantium, in which capital the same apostle St. Andrew had appointed Stachys to be the first bishop. "Hence the *indissoluble* connection of the Russian with the Greek Church, and the dependence of her metropolitans during six centuries upon the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople, until, with its consent, she (Russia) obtained her own equality and independence in that which was accorded to her native primates."*

Setting aside a vast number of incidents and episodes of

* Mouravieff's "History of the Russian Church," p. 8.

doubtful authenticity in the traditionary annals of the origin of Christianity in Russia, each of which has its accompanying miracle, for the honour and glory of the infantile days of the Orthodox Church, we come to an event in connection with its early history, which serves to fix an epoch in its origin, and to invest its divinity with something of human interest.

In A.D. 992, the Pagan Russian Prince Vladimir demanded of the Christian Greek Emperor the hand of his sister, the Princess Anne, in marriage. The Greek Emperor courteously and Christianly answered Vladimir, he would consent to the proposed marriage, provided the Prince would embrace Christianity. Vladimir, whose heart was set on embracing the Princess Anne, gave his consent to become a Christian, saying: "He had long since examined and conceived a love for the Greek law." With all due respect for the Orthodox Church, and the first Russian Prince that belonged to it, we may take it for granted that Vladimir had conceived a love for the Greek Princess prior even to his love for the Greek law. The Princess Anne, with a good cortège, and a goodly retinue of bishops, monks, and venerable clergymen, sailed from Cherson, and on her arrival induced Prince Vladimir to hasten his baptism, he being sorely affected by a complaint of his eyes. So that the Prince was baptized, married, and cured of his sore eyes, all at once. Several lords and ladies of the Court were baptized on the same occasion, and by the same Bishop of Cherson, who baptized and married the Prince, in the Church of the Blessed Virgin, and so great became the zeal of Vladimir for the Patroness of that church, that a little later he erected a cathedral to her honour, in his capital, Kieff. In a very short time all the citizens of high rank of the Russian metropolis, were all Christians. Vladimir taking a rather strong measure to induce the people to be converted. He issued a proclamation declaring "that whoever on the morrow should not repair to the river (Dneiper) to be baptized, whether rich or poor, he should hold for his enemy."* The whole of the inhabitants of the city, ac-

* Mouravieff, ib. p. 15.

cordingly came to the river, and were baptized *en masse;* "the priests reading the prayers from the shore, and naming at once whole companies by the same name."

Up to 1197, the election of metropolitans of the Russian Church was made uniformly, and *de juré* by the Patriarch of the Greek Church in Constantinople; but in that year a synod of Russian bishops "resolved not to have a Greek again for a metropolitan."

"They all agreed to take the election of a metropolitan into their own hands, without the Patriarch having any participation in the matter. Only one voice, that of St. Niphont, of Novogarod, protested strongly against this infraction of Church unity, and of the canonical dependence of the heirarchy, without which the infant Church of Russia could not rightly subsist."*

The synod elected one Clement, a monk, metropolitan, "and the bishop Onaphries proposed as a substitute for patriarchal consecration, that in ordaining Clement, they should lay on his head the hand of St. Clement, Pope of Rome, whose relics had been brought from Cherson to Kieff by Vladimir."

A religious war was the result of this uncanonical election, which lasted for nearly a century, and involved princes and prelates, towns and cities, in ruin; and was only suspended when another and direr element of destruction came from the East on Russia—the invasion of the Moguls, in 1205,—and in 1240 another irruption of the same hordes, laid the ancient capital of Russia—Kieff—with all its christian temples in utter ruin.

In 1582, Job, Archbishop of Rostoff, was raised to the Primacy of Moscow and all Russia, and from this time the annals of the Russian Patriarchs date.

In 1587, an event of great importance in the Russian Church took place. The Turks were then, and had been for one hundred and thirty-four years, in possession of the Greek Empire,

* Mouravieff, ib. p. 85.

and all its cities. Two Greek Patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople, had visited Moscow, soliciting pecuniary aid for their churches, then terribly oppressed by the Mohammedans.

An idea which had originated seven years previously in 1580, namely, of establishing a Russian Patriarchate, independent altogether of the Greek Patriarchate, was now taken up by the Czar Theodore, and pressed on the Patriarch of Constantinople, who was then in Russia, Jeremiah II. This dignitary of the Greek Church had suffered for the faith, in Rhodes, and had been imprisoned there by Amurath I.

The Muscovite Church was then depending on the Greek Patriarch for its canonical privileges, on this poor outcast Patriarch Jeremiah, then a fugitive from the seat of his jurisdiction, in a country ruled over by Mohammedans. The Czar Theodore, proposed to the Greek Patriarch Jeremiah, to remain in Russia, and to set up his Patriarchal throne in the city of Vladimir. The Greek Patriarch piously and prudently declined to assent to the tempting proposal, being unwilling to compromise in any degree, the interests of his own see and seat of jurisdiction, and returned to Constantinople.

The Czar Theodore then turned his thoughts towards the metropolitan of Moscow, Job, and proposed to the synod of bishops, to enter into negociations with the Greek Patriarch, Jeremiah, for the creation of a distinct and independent Patriarch of the Greek Church, and carried with a high hand his supreme will into effect. The complaisant synod of bishops, and what is more surprising, the complaisant Greek Patriarch, obeyed the orders of the Czar, and the new institution of a Patriarchate of Moscow was duly established. So the Russian Church had an independent existence from 1587.

The Czar Peter the Great began to meddle in the spiritual affairs of his Empire in 1700, in a manner calculated to give umbrage to the Patriarch and metropolitans; but whatever offence was taken by the rulers of the Church, no opposition was hazarded to the will of Peter. The ferocious autocrat changed ecclesiastical usages, though of minor importance,

without deigning to consult the prelates and clergy. He transferred the festival of the new year to the 1st of January, to make it conformable with the customs of other European countries, without troubling the ecclesiastical authorities with any consideration of the subject.

The Patriarch, however, resented this interference with his authority by refusing to officiate at the solemn liturgy, in the Czar's presence at this festival. Peter next announced his intention of reforming the laws, and defining the limits of the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The Patriarch, then in a dying state, in vain issued orders to ecclesiastics to make collections of the Imperial decrees, according immunities and privileges to the Russian Church, furnished these collections to the secular functionaries charged by the Czar with the legal reforms he commanded, and besought them to respect the sacred rights of the Holy Orthodox Russian Church.

The worthy Patriarch died the latter end of 1700, and the Chamberlain of the Emperor Nicholas, M. Mouravieff, in his history of these beginnings of the enslavement of the Russian Church by the Czars, ventures only to observe:

"The Patriarch departed this life the end of the year 1700, and with him the personal dignity of the office of Patriarch in the Russian Church came to an end."*

It is a remarkable circumstance, that two Princes signally remarkable for assigning to themselves spiritual missions, claiming and exercising the right of interfering in councils and synods in matters appertaining to Church government, have been men of furious passions, cruel, unrelenting, and unnatural.

Constantine, who meddled much in matters of religion, had his own son put to death in a fit of rage, and infurious for revenge.

Peter the Great was continually meddling with the govern-

* Mouravieff, ib. p. 262.

ment of the Church of his nation; he, too, had his son condemned to death, and was only spared from shedding that son's blood by the sudden extinction of life from the effects of terror on the young man's mind occasioned by that sentence.

In 1721 the furibund autocrat of all the Russias, determined on a fundamental change in the constitution of the National Church of Russia. He went through the forms of consulting metropolitans, bishops, and archimandrites, of having synods convoked, and the proposed change in the Church deliberated on by them. Peter's daring project for enslaving the Orthodox Church, and making it the bond servant of the State, was committed to a courtier prelate, Theophanes, Bishop of Pskoff, and successfully carried through the synod.

The decree ordaining this great change, was signed and sealed by the Czar Peter, and seven of the highest functionaries of the State, and received the signatures of the guardian of the Patriarchal throne, two metropolitans, four bishops, and six archimandrites, and all the Hegumens of the first rank in the Russian Church.

Immediately after this solemn act and declaration of the will of the autocrat was ratified and executed by the ecclesiastical council, and the grave aspect of a sacred formula given to it, the new ecclesiastical institution for the government of the Orthodox Russian Church, was opened with all due pomp and solemnity in the presence of the Czar. This institution was called "The most Holy Governing Synod of the Orthodox Russian Church."

This synod was a spiritual body, permanently established to rule and govern the Russian Church. This title was inserted in all the litanies and places in the liturgies wherein the Patriarchs were formerly mentioned, as the head rulers of the Church. To its administration were committed all the estates, landed and other property of the bishops and monasteries which had previously been under the ecclesiastical management.

The election of bishops, right of jurisdiction over spiritual persons, except in capital cases, which were to be tried in the

different courts, all matters of heresy and schism, questions concerning marriage and divorce, previously belonging to the Patriarchal Court of Requests, and later to the metropolitan's jurisdiction, were now referred to the jurisdiction of the synod.

The former chief ruler of the Church, the metropolitan Stephen was named President of the "Most Holy Governing Synod," with the same voice in its decisions as the other members. There were two Vice-Presidents, both of them archbishops. The other members were one archbishop, six archimandrites of as many monasteries, two hegumens, one priest monk, and two arch priests. Such was the original composition of the "Most Holy Governing Synod."

The patriarchal headship of the Church, was in fact substituted by the new synodical institution, the working of which was virtually in the hands of the Czar.

In the valuable notes to M. Mouravieff's work, we find the following observation as to the dependence of the synod on the Czar :—

"The synod has been substituted for the Patriarchate. The appointment of the members of the synod as they change, depends chiefly on the will of the Emperor, as supreme governor of the Church, and the representations of the High Procurator."

When a vacancy occurs in a bishopric, the synod proceeds to select three ecclesiastics as being worthy of nomination. The list with the three names of eligible persons for the episcopal office is then sent to the Czar, who is supposed to consult the synod before he elects one from the list of the three eligible persons, and to be guided by its views of fitness for the vacant office.*

The Patriarch of the Orthodox Church in Russia, whose patriarchal seat was in the ancient capital of Kieff, and if not dependent on, was long subordinate in rank to the Patriarch of

* Mouravieff's "History of the Church of Russia."

Constantinople. In course of time that dependence or subordination, was abolished, and about a century after the independence of the Russian Patriarch was effected, Peter the Great abolished the Patriarchate, appropriated its revenues, and instituted in its place a synod for the regulation and government of all temporal matters and affairs appertaining to religion, and its relations with the State, by its constitution wholly dependent on the Czar.

At the beginning of the 18th century the Czar, Peter the Great, obliged the synod to declare and acknowledge him head of the Orthodox Church of Russia. The synod is composed of Metropolitans and Archbishops, under the presidency of the archbishop of Novorogod, and of a lay delegate, who presents an annual report to the Emperor.

The prelates of the Synod are supposed solely to have cognizance of matters concerning faith and morals; and neither the Czar nor the lay delegate claim a right to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs, or in aught that relates to rites, doctrine, or discipline.

Nevertheless, if he chose to usurp and exercise such a right, it is very clear there is nothing to prevent him in the composition of the Synod. And it is even questionable whether the title conferred on him by the servile Synod, might not authorise him to interfere in the spiritual concerns of a Church of which he is the head—recognised by the superior prelates of the Church.

SEPARATION OF THE GREEKS FROM THE LATIN CHURCH.

The Greeks from the time they separated from the Latin Church, continued to recognise four Patriarchs in conformity with the decisions of the council of Chalcedon, in the year 451, those of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, the supremacy being in that of Constantinople. At the close of the 16th century the Patriarch of Constantinople exercised

his jurisdiction over all Christians of the Oriental rite. The Church under his jurisdiction had long previously assumed the title of "The Orthodox Church." The Patriarch, or Œcumenic chief of this Church governed the churches of European Turkey, of Asia Minor, of Greece, the Islands of the Ægean, the two Mœsias, the trans-Danubian provinces, and even those of Russia.

In the vicissitudes of the Turkish Empire, Churches shared the fate of provinces. Several churches were separated altogether from the jurisdiction of the Œcumenic Patriarch of Constantinople.

At the present time the total number of persons professing to be of the Greek Church, not in communion with that of Rome, in all countries, in Russia, Turkey, Greece and Austria, is estimated at 71,000,000, of whom 64,000,00 are of what is called the Orthodox Church, 6,500,000 Monophysites, and 40,000 Nestorians.

The appellation of Greek (Roum) in official language is not applied exclusively to the populations of Hellenic origin, subjects of the Porte. It is used to designate indiscriminately all those of its Christian subjects of whatever descent, who recognise the civil and religious jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

The number of subjects of the Porte under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and forming the Greek nation or community, may be estimated at 6,000,000. Of this number rather less than two millions are Romans (a name given to the Greeks of Turkey to distinguish them from the Hellenes); the rest are almost entirely Sclavonian.

The Greek race is dispersed throughout the whole empire, but in unequal proportions. In European Turkey it forms about the eleventh part of the whole population, in Asia Minor it scarcely amounts to the twenty-fifth part; whilst in the islands it may be calculated at three-fourths. Metellin contains 60,000 Greeks out of 80,000 inhabitants; Rhodes 28,000 out of 38,000.

The Greeks of European Turkey, are in number from 950,000 to 100,000, about one-half of whom inhabit Constantinople and Thrace; the remainder are found in Thessaly and other provinces, sometimes in isolated bodies, sometimes intermingled.

The Greeks of Syria and Asia Minor are dispersed throughout the seaports of the Levant, from Trebizond to Jaffa, and St. Jean d'Acre. Their numbers decrease in proportion to the distance from the coast; and beyond a certain limit they are only found in great commercial towns, frequented by caravans; such as Angora, Alleppo, Damascus, &c.

The agricultural population consists almost exclusively of Turks, Armenians, and Kurds.

Among the immediate subjects of the Porte, of Sclavonic origin, the Bulgarians hold the first rank.

Their number may be computed at not less than three millions, or three times that of the Greek population of European Turkey.

The Greeks despise the Sclavonians, calling them barbarians, and *kondrokephalai* (wooden heads), as they did even in the time of Michael Palæologus, 1261; on the other hand, the astute and wily spirit of the Greeks is utterly repugnant to the Sclavonians, who regard them with jealousy and distrust.

Next in order come the Servians of Bosnia and the Herzegovine, in number about 1,500,000, about one-third of whom are Mussulmans, and the Servians of Metotria. This name is given to that portion of Albania, which extends over the districts of Prezzina (the ancient capital of Servia, under the King Douchan) or Prichtina, and of Novi Bazar. The Sclavonic population of this country may be estimated at two hundred thousand.

The Vlaques, or Zingaris, sometimes classed with the Greeks, sometimes with the Sclavonians, belong in reality to neither of these races. Originating, as their name indicates, in Wallachia, whence they emigrated at different times into the

southern provinces, they sprang like the Wallachians of the Danube, from the Roman colonies which Trajan sent into ancient Dacia. . . .

"A document recently published at Athens computes the number of Zingaris dispersed through Greece and the Turkish provinces of Thessaly and Macedonia at 600,000.

"This is probably an exaggeration, as the number in Turkey itself does not appear to exceed 200,000 or 220,000 individuals. In recapitulation we have:—

Greeks	2,000,000
Sclaves	4,400,000
Bosnians and Herzegovinians . .	1,000,000
Bulgarians	3,000,000
Metotrians	200,000
Montenegrins	200,000
Vlaques or Zingaris . . .	200,000
Total . . .	11,000,000

If we subtract from this total about 600,000 Catholics (Greeks, Bulgarians, Bosnians, &c.), belonging to European Turkey, we shall find that of the remaining numbers six millions will fairly represent the effective strength of the Greek community in the Ottoman Empire."* Of the above mentioned eleven millions the portion belonging to the Greek race is very small. The following passage is from a pamphlet by the Rev. W. G. Schauffler, D.D., one of the missionaries, published some years since by the Turkish London Missionary Society:—

"The vast number of so-called Greeks in the Turkish Empire is a mere illusion. Their true number is 2,050,000. The other so-called Greeks are in reality Bulgarians, Bosnians, Albanians, &c. &c."

"The Christian population of Constantinople (says the Abbé

* Letters on Turkey, by M. Ubicini, vol. ii.

Michou) is considerable. The Greeks, not in union, are about 100,000; the Armenians, not in union, about 80,000; the Latins, 12,000. As there is no regular official census of the population of the Ottoman Empire, the numbers obtained are not always very precise. Thus, I was told by some persons, that there were a million and a half Armenians in the empire, whilst others raised the number to three millions.

The Greek Patriarch, who is named Anthimos, is about seventy years of age. He is an able man; takes the title of œcumenical patriarch of the great church of Constantinople. He is the head of the synod, which consists of twelve members. These members are archbishops, *in partibus*, whose dioceses are governed by vicar bishops, called archimandrites.

"There is some property belonging to the Greek churches, of which the bishops have the usufruct. Each parish also makes an annual collection for the bishops. Four or five laymen, forming a commission, go to every house with a register, and receive the offerings of the faithful. The collection in the churches on Good Friday is applied to the same purpose.

"There are some bishops whose revenues are considerable. A bishop of Macedonia was mentioned to me, who has 1,000,000 piastres (250,000 francs): the archbishop of Smyrna has a million and a half of piastres.

"Every bishop is obliged to pay an annual fine to the Patriarch, and this sum is considerable, because the bishops are absolutely dependent upon him. He can remove them at pleasure. To do this he issues a decree, which is sanctioned by the synod, and the Turkish authority executes the sentence. Every bishop or archbishop gives money to keep his office; and the Patriarch thus obtains a considerable income."

The Christian populations in the East were placed by the powers given to the Patriarchate in a very anomalous position.

In M. Borè's work, published in 1847, we are told,—"The Patriarch of the Christian communities denominated Milleti, remaining invested, not only with all their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but also with a certain judicial power which

enabled them to inflict on the members of their flock not only fines but bastinadoes and imprisonment; it followed that the members of the Greek, Armenian and other churches were subject to two distinct authorities."

The Turkish government incurred not only the odium of its own acts of cruelty and oppression, which indeed were more than enough to damn it, but the damage done to character and authority by the oppressive acts very often of the dignitaries of those churches of the Rayahs.

And secondly, because their priests have been always faithful to the principles of nationality of the masses, and have at all times, and in all the provinces of Turkey, more than participated in their patriotic sentiments, if I may so speak of their aspirations after independence, and detestation of their Turkish oppressors: nay, stimulated, revived and encouraged them when they became faint or of diminished energy, vigor, and virility.

This is a very considerable fact, a circumstance well deserving of notice, that a priesthood exceedingly illiterate, in fact, without a tincture of secular learning, and very little knowledge of the history of their own church, nay, most slenderly provided professionally in relation to their own ritual canons, and theological controversies and decisions, a clergy extremely poor and burdensome on that account to the peasantry and working classes generally, who possess no influence in high places, and have sprung out of the ranks of the poor and industrious, should yet have such a strong hold of the people's hearts and affections; and should have, for upwards of four centuries, retained their power and influence over the Greek population of the Turkish Empire, attached to their church and to their religion. The same observation applies to the relations between the priests and the people of Russia.

I doubt if in *this age* there be as much sincere strong faith abounding in enthusiasm in any Roman Catholic country in Europe, with one exception, as there is in Russia.

I desire to be understood and not mistaken or misrepresented

on this subject, which I think is an important one. I believe the Russians are perfectly sincere in their religious sentiments, and generally speaking, not only decorous but devout in their religious practices, and especially in their veneration and reverence for the Blessed Virgin, and firmly confident in the efficacy of prayer for the intercession of The Pania.

I know that their co-religionists in Greece, and throughout the Turkish Empire, who are no less attached to their religion and their Church, though by no means practically such worthy members of it, have not the most remote knowledge of the distinctive characters of the Greek and Latin Churches; that they are ignorant, far more ignorant than any Roman Catholic people in the main now are in matters of religion.

Roman Catholic travellers in the Levant are amazed, hardly less than Protestant ones, at the constant recurrence of genuflexions (Metanoia) in the religious ceremonies in the Greek Church generally, but in the monasteries there seems to be no end of them. In some services they are repeated three hundred times in succession. In these muscular *exercises* (of the knee joints especially) and in repeated diurnal repetitions of offices, consisting chiefly of portions of psalms and multitudinous prayers chaunted in monotonous, sing-song, nasal intonations, the poor Greek caloyers pass the greater portion of their lives. I have often marvelled that the fact never seems to have occurred to those who framed those liturgies and offices of such inordinate length, who multiplied so exceedingly those wearisome genuflexions and monotonous intonations, those long, diffusive prayers and psalms, of equal length, on which the Rev. Sidney Smith has descanted, namely, that we are not living in antediluvian times, when men attained the good round age of eight or nine hundred years, and that compositions for our days of three or four score years at the utmost, should be correspondingly abridged and abbreviated.

But whatever evidences of obliviousness of our greatly reduced term of existence we find in the liturgy and ritual of the Greek Church, in the religious services and offices of the

monasteries, especially in regard to multiplied forms and illimitable formulas of prayer and psalmody, in one respect the clergy of the Greek Church seem to have some notion of the present limited period of men's lives, the enfeebled energies of their physical constitution, and impaired capabilities of organic endurance, and of the lessened power of human patience—*Their clergy preach short sermons.*

Have the clergy of the Latin, and the Lutheran, and Calvinist Churches nothing to learn from the ecclesiastics of the Greek Church? Is there no antediluvian theological circumlocution of boundless space in the latitude and longitude of their limits of power of lung and tongue in the pulpit?

Oh, spiritual guides and shepherds of all our churches, for heaven's sake, for poor humanity's sake (constituted as it now is, short lived and full of miseries, of manifold infirmities, of corporeal energies easily exhausted, of powers of attention and patience speedily worn out), study to preach short, learn to compress, strive to strike home to the heart, and cease to be diffuse and soporific, or ornate and dogmatic for one mortal hour in the pulpit!

The frequency and rigour of the fasts in the monasteries of the Greek Church, exceed anything of the kind in usage in those of the Latin Church.

"At the commencement of Lent, nearly three whole days, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of Quinquagesima week are passed without eating or drinking; the kitchen and refectory are closed, and the first meal permitted is on Wednesday afternoon at three or four o'clock. The same austerity is practised at the conclusion of Lent; from Holy Thursday the monks remain without food till the following Saturday evening; oil and wine are forbidden during Lent, and the rest of the year they fast on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, except in the interval between Easter and Whitsuntide."*

The Greeks have four Lents (tessaracosti) in the year, one

* Les Actes des Apostles Modernes, vol. ii. p. 81.

before Easter lasts eight weeks; one after Pentecost, three weeks; one of the Holy Virgin, in August, fourteen days; and one before Christmas, of forty days. They have, moreover, three fasts, one of twenty-six days, before the feast of St. Demetrius; one of four days for the festival of the raising of the cross; and one of eight days in honour of St. Michael, preceding his festival. They have, also, all the Wednesdays and Fridays in every week, and at certain periods, Monday, also; finally, they have three vigils, namely, of the Epiphany, St. John the Baptist, and of the Cross, making a total of 238 days in the year in which they must either fast or abstain from flesh meat, fish, milk, butter, and cheese. So that there remains, out of the 365 days of the year, 127 clear days for the unfortunate member of the Orthodox Greek Church to "eat, drink, and be merry," without ecclesiastical restraint on his pantry, larder, and kitchen, and religious interference with his stomach and palate.

THE GREEK SECULAR CLERGY OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

The miserable income of the priests of the Orthodox Greek Church, derived from the exercise of ecclesiastical functions, would not enable them to live, if they had only to support themselves; but those who are married, and have families to provide for, a very large portion, and perhaps the largest number of them, could not possibly exist, and obtain the means of existence for their families, without having recourse to manual labour of some kind in aid of their very slender professional resources. Their mode of life is of the simplest and most frugal description; it scarcely differs from that of the peasantry amongst whom they are located. I have lived in their houses, and often shared, for many days together, their humble fare, and am competent to speak of their condition. I have had ample means, too, of forming an opinion of their

social qualities, domestic laws, and moral conduct, and my experience is favourable to them in all these respects.

They are, with very few exceptions, as far as my experience goes, of irreproachable morals, strictly observant of religious duties, simple and sincere in their belief, frugal of necessity, and from choice, habit, and religious influence, temperate, kind and affectionate to their families, and charitable as far as their circumstances enable them to be.

Ignorant indeed they are, and to an extent that would seem almost incredible. Very few are acquainted even with the general nature of their own doctrines, or with the ancient language of their own ritual, and the writings of the Greek fathers.

They are compelled by their indigence to be importunate in urging their pecuniary claims on their flocks, but however pressing they may be for payment of their dues, I am very far from believing that they are either exorbitant in their demands, or oppressive in their dealings with the poor of their communities. They are sincerely attached to their religion, and, with very few exceptions indeed, without knowing exactly on what specific grounds; they are very strongly opposed to the name and reputed tenets of every other Christian Church, those especially of the Roman Catholic Religion.

It would be equally in vain to inquire of them and expect to obtain from them a plain outline even of the fundamental doctrines of their Church and of the Roman Catholic religion: and much more hopeless would it be to get any definite statement of the differences which separate the two Churches. In the monasteries one would have a better chance, than among the working secular clergy of getting information on such subjects.

Travellers are disappointed when they converse with the poor Greek priests on the mission in the Turkish provinces, in the islands of the Ægean, and even in the Hellenic kingdom, and expect to find an accurate knowledge of those important differences. But they discover that the Councils of Nice and Chalcedon are hardly known even by name, and with respect

to the "filioque" cause of contention and dissidence, that they are in a state of primœval innocence.

They are in contented, if not blissful ignorance of everything in the Latin Church, except of the existence of a Pope, of baptism by immersion, and the employment of unleavened bread in the Eucharist; and, holding the religion of the Latins therefore in abhorrence, they glory in belonging to "The Orthodox Church."

Ubicini gives a very striking illustration of the state of decadence of the Greek Orthodox Church, continually undermined, as he thinks and considered it to be, so late as 1849. He says, as description would convey feebly the impression of the evils which these corruptions—namely, simony, superstition, fanaticism, and imposture entail on the people, he prefers to retail a conversation which he held with a Greek of Smyrna, during the holy week of 1849.

Of this conversation I will only cite a few passages in corroboration of other statements in this volume on the same subject:—

"Alas!" exclaimed the Greek, "Busbequius,* does not exaggerate when he declares that our priests make money of everything, the episcopacy, the priesthood, baptism, the communion of the dying, the holy sacraments, and the dignities of the Church, are all alike bought and sold. You may accuse yourself to the Pneumaticos† of no matter what crime, absolution certainly follows if you pay in proportion to the offence; for every sin with us has its price. The same holds good with regard to divorce, excommunication,‡ and the other abuses so frequent in our Church. Nowhere is the maxim, that the priest must live by the altar, practised on so grand a scale, and at the same

* See Lettres de Busbeq, 1748, vol. i. p. 122.

† Pneumaticos in the Greek Church,—the priest who receives confessions.

‡ Excommunications are very frequent in the Greek Church, and often on grounds unconnected with religion:—For example, an individual who has been robbed, may get his whole household excommunicated until the guilty party declares himself. The bishop, however, is the principal gainer. He is paid for pronouncing the excommunication, and also for removing it.

time with so little scandal, as with us, for even those who suffer by the system are not shocked at it."*

The Orthodox Greek Church permits its secular clergy (parochial ecclesiastics) to marry, with certain limitations; the marriage of a papas, or priest, must precede his entrance into holy orders. He cannot espouse a widow, and in the event of his wife dying, he cannot take a second.

In Turkey he must wear a band of muslin round his cap, as a distinctive mark of the married state; and so long as his wife lives, he cannot attain to any higher office in the Church than that of a Prolo-papas. Celibacy is strictly required of the higher orders of the Greek clergy.

In Turkey, however, this interdiction with respect to the latter is taken little into account.

Parishes of considerable extent, and schools connected with them, are placed under the management of civil magistrates—"Eppores." The subordinate parochial clergy are paid out of the parish funds, derived from alms, collections in churches, surplice fees, &c.

The priests in the minor towns in the provinces, and in the villages throughout the country, "are wretchedly poor," and, I must add, wretchedly ignorant; but by no means, I must affirm, immoral, ill disposed, or unmindful of their obligations, so far as they understand them, to their flocks, or at least the poor, industrious portion of them, with whom alone they come in contact. Their income is derived from fees of small amounts, contributions from the peasantry for performing the house blessing, at the beginning of every month, called "Aghiasmos." Out of his slender means the country priest has to pay a portion of his dues to the bishop of his diocese, and a fixed sum of two ducats at Easter and the Epiphany, under pain of excommunication. The country priests are in continual dread of incurring this penalty, or of being interdicted for very slight transgressions in his office.

Of the inferior clergy of the Orthodox Church of the Greeks

* Ubicini, Letters on Turkey, vol. ii. p. 158.

in the Turkish Empire nothing favourable to their position, attainments, or acquirements, can be said. Let us take the ecclesiastical establishment of a parish and its church, designated Ephimeria.

The first clerical functionary—"Præstos," officiates in rites and ceremonies, such as baptisms, marriages, and burials. It is his office to recite the Lord's Prayer, Creed, &c., &c., in the ritual.

The second—"Pneumatico," or confessor—must be at least forty years of age, and have a written license from the bishop.

The third—"The Papas Ephimero"—his office is to recite the liturgy, to chant the matins and vespers, and assist in all the church ceremonies.

Then follows the Deacon and choristers, the Canonarch, or reader, who recites hymns; and lastly, the sacristan, or beadle (Candelanaptis), literally, candle lighter.

Ubicini deals, I think more severely with the Greek priests than they deserve:—

"They have no conception of Christianity but in its external rites, and can only teach others what they believe and practise themselves. Their whole religion consists in the constant repetition of the sign of the cross, in attending mass, in kissing the pictures which adorn the templon (or screen), and in the strict observance of Lent and the other fasts. . . .

"Still these village priests, notwithstanding their poverty, which scarcely raises them above the level of the lowest peasant, and their ignorance, which retains them where their poverty has placed them, are far more estimable than the dignified clergy. Their fanaticism, a necessary consequence of their ignorance, is at least perfectly sincere, and it is by their influence alone that the people have been preserved faithful to the religion of their ancestors. . . .

"If he cannot otherwise instruct he can teach them patience by his own example, and give them some consolation under present ills by the recital of traditions and pious legends, which

announce, in a speedily approaching future, the fall of the Ottoman domination, and the final triumph of the cross. Thus it is that faith has survived among the people, and with faith, nationality. The farther we go from the capital, and remove from the influence of the Patriarch and the synod, the more striking does this result become. In the Morea the priests, and even the bishops never omitted to mingle national recollections, and hopes of an approaching national restoration with the doctrines and rites of religion. When the insurrection broke out, the clergy were the first to take up arms, and their example was all powerful in rousing the rest of Greece. Let not such things, however, be expected from our bishops and metropolitans. I would not, with Zallony, accuse them of intentionally riveting the chains of our country by working in concert with Turks and Fanariotes, to debase the national character. The animosity of Zallony towards the Fanar has led him into exaggerations; but when has a Patriarch ever refused to launch the thunders of his Church against his brethren guilty of rebellion against the Turks? Think of Rhigas, and more recently still, Hypsilanti. Perhaps you will say the Patriarch was compelled to act as he did. Granted; but a man may always choose between the committal of a base action, and death."*

The deposition of a Greek Patriarch does not disqualify him from again being elected; several have been deposed—some as many as six times—and subsequently re-elected. Crusius, in his Lives of the Patriarchs, states that from 1453 to 1574, thirteen Patriarchs were deposed or imprisoned, two abdicated, four have been put to death; one was poisoned, two were put to the sword, in the reign of Mohammed IV., in 1651 and 1657, in times of panic, on suspicion of high treason; and so late as 1821, the venerable, innocent, and good man, the Patriarch Gregory, on suspicion of treason, wholly groundless, was executed by the orders of the Sultan Mahmoud, so much cele-

* Letters of M. Ubicini, vol. ii.

brated for his reforms, especially in the Janissary Institution, of a very sweeping description.

The metropolitans are of two classes—Gerontes, ancients; Panicrolati, most holy.

The suffragan bishops are called Despotès, masters; and also Theophilislate (very dear to God).

The metropolitans and archbishops are nominated by the synod: they appoint their own suffragans.

Every new prelate has to pay an enormous contribution to the Patriarch, varying from £150 to £750 sterling.

The synod of the Greek Church styles itself—"The Servants of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, and the metropolitans of the synod holding council."

When a Patriarch is elected or deposed, there are delegates of the rulers of all the principal churches present in addition to the twelve metropolitans, the bishop and lay clergy, the secular notables of the capital, under the presidency of the highest ecclesiastical dignitary present, in the absence of a Patriarch, and since 1847, three lay members, in virtue of an order from the Porte, notwithstanding the strenuous opposition of the Patriarch, as an innovation contrary to the holy canons and immunities of the Patriarchate.

The Porte, moreover, delegates a commissioner, who is present during the election, and at its termination. The Porte endeavoured to get rid of the remonstrances of the Patriarch by declaring it was not intended the lay delegates should take any part in the spiritual concerns of the Church, deliberated on in the synod, as to doctrine or discipline, nor a direct part in the appointment of archbishops. This step of the Porte is the introduction of the small end of the wedge of temporal power interference in ecclesiastical affairs.

The claims of Russia to a protectorate over the Rayahs of the Greek Church in the Turkish Empire, are based on the Treaty of Kainardji, of 1744. By article 7, of that treaty, the Sublime Porte promises to protect the Christian religion and the Greek Church; and the Imperial Court of Russia is allowed on all

necessary occasions, to make representations concerning persons in the Turkish Empire connected with the Greek Church.

By Article 14th, "permission was given to erect a public church of the Greek religion in the street called 'Beg Ogalou,' in the suburb of Galata." By Article 18th, "Russian subjects were to have full liberty to visit Jerusalem, and no contribution or tax was to be exacted from these pilgrims and travellers." By Article 19th, "Russia restored the islands of the Archipelago to the Sublime Porte, with this reservation, that the Christian religion in them should not be exposed to the least oppression, and that no obstacle should be opposed to the erection or repair of churches of the Greek community, and that their clergy should not be oppressed or insulted.

The Patriarchal income of the head of the Orthodox Greek Church in Constantinople, derived from fees paid in his chancelry, contributions from prelates on their appointments or preferments, the collation of curacies, a tax on causes brought before his tribunal. The whole of his revenue amounts to from £3,000 to £4,000 sterling, annually.

From the time of the conquest of Constantinople for some years it was customary for the Sultan to present a gift annually of £100 a year to the Patriarch. Mohammed II. commenced this munificent custom, but it did not long survive.

The jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople (still ostentatiously styled æcumenic) is limited, at the present time, to the Greek churches in the immediate possession of the Sultans, viz., Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia, part of Epirus, Syria, and some other regions in Asia Minor and Egypt. He exercises a direct authority over six millions of "Orthodox Believers," of whom two millions are Greeks, and four millions Sclavonians.

The churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, are under the jurisdiction of their several Patriarchs, each having a syñod, but without any civil authority, and claiming independence of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople.

Of the 71,000,000 members of the Greek Church, separated

from the Roman Catholic religion, there are in the Turkish Empire, according to Ubicini, in round numbers 13,000,000.

Of the Orthodox Greek church .	10,000,000
Of the Monophysites . . .	3,000,000

The latter include 2,375,000 Armenians; and Jacobites, 65,000.

In 1843 a spiritual war broke out, and was carried on for several years, on account of the Greek synod of Jerusalem claiming to elect their Patriarch, without reference to the Patriarch of Constantinople. This contest threatened a schism in the Orthodox Church, within the last four years. The Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem was erected in 418 and confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon in 451. The Patriarchs of Jerusalem have been always elected by their own synods, notifying their election to the other Patriarchs. This Patriarchate is the poorest of all. It appears in no small degree anomalous, that the Patriarch of Jerusalem should reside chiefly with a portion of his clergy, at Constantinople. At Balata, a suburb adjoining the Fanar, fourteen metropolitans and bishops, most with honorary titles of sees, acknowledge his jurisdiction.

The Greek Church of Servia, from the 13th century, enjoyed the right of nominating its own metropolitans, and consecrating its own bishops, having broken the connection with the Patriarch of Constantinople. In 1340 their prelates in synod in the city of Scopia, elected a Patriarch of their own, styling him Patriarch of Servia, Bulgaria, and Illyria. The Patriarch of Constantinople in synod, lost no time in excommunicating the new Patriarch and all his clergy. This anathema in 1376 was taken off by another Patriarch of Constantinople, who recognised the rights of the Patriarch of Servia.

At the expiration of four centuries the Patriarchate was abolished, in 1766, when, after the manner of Polish partition, there was a dismemberment of Servia, and a portion passed into the hands of the great territorial highway robber—Austria. The

Patriarch of Servia under Austrian rule—Carlowitz, the ancient seat of the Patriarch being occupied by that Power—dwindled down into an archbishop.

The three principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Servia, now fiefs only, and tributary territories of the Porte, having administrative governmental institutions of their own, are governed in religious affairs by their respective metropolitans who, at their installations pay a contribution to the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople.

The Hellenic Church, that of liberated Greece, by a declaration of the first assembly or provisional government of Calamata in 1821, confirmed by a decision of the clergy assembled at Nauplia the 4th of August, 1833, and by a statute of the Holy Synod of Constantinople, the 11th of June, 1850, promulgated its independence, acknowledging no other supremacy in the constitution of its government, than that of a permanent synod of bishops presided over by the Metropolitan of Athens.

MONKS AND MONASTERIES OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

The Eastern Church differs in one respect particularly from the Latin Church—the paucity of Monastic orders. The rule of Basil and that of St. Anthony, with few exceptions, from the earliest to the present time have been those of the Greek Church. The Greek monks are divided into two classes—*cenobites*, or ordinary communities, and anchorets (idiorithmes) who live separately, unless on certain festivals (in recent times) when they eat in common.

Each monastery is governed by a prior (hegvumenos), whose office is for life, or in his absence or non-existence of one by a providor or steward (epitros), elected annually by the community.

The brethren are divided into ordinary monks (monachi) and consecrated monks (ieromonachi), the latter are the learned

portion of the community. Their time is divided between employment, religious duties, and manual labour, cultivation of the grounds of the monastery, providing food and other necessaries, tending cattle, and domestic affairs.

Formerly, monasteries abounded in all the provinces of European Turks, especially in Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, the Morea, and the Islands of the Ægean, and on the sea borders of Asia Minor. Among those still existing the most remarkable are those of Mount Athos, Meteora, Mount Sinai, and of the Princes Islands.

The Greeks designate Mount Athos, "the Holy Mountain," and in this designation is comprehended not only the peak of Mount Athos, but the Peninsula of about forty miles in length, by nine at its greatest breadth, between the gulfs of Contessa and Monte Santo, which forms the eastern extremity of Macedonia.

Mount Athos, snow-capped, even in summer, rises in the centre to a height of about 6,000 feet with a base of about seventy miles in circumference. Numbers of vast enclosures, Cenobite towns on a small scale, formerly existed on the sides of the mountain on lofty peaks, inhabited by monks, and several still exist, but the number of inmates is greatly reduced. Two of the existing monasteries on the west side founded by a king of Servia in the twelfth century, are occupied by Bulgarian monks, who perform their rules and offices in the Sclavonic tongue. One monastery for Russian monks was founded by the Empress Catherine.

Several hermitages are scattered on the highest peaks, tenanted by anchorets called Philerèmes. At the present time the number of monasteries in the district of Mount Athos is about twenty. There are about one hundred and twenty hermitages. The number of chapels, oratories, and shrines, in a space not exceeding ten leagues in diameter, is estimated at nine hundred and thirty. Most of the monasteries were founded and richly endowed by the Greek Emperors. It is worthy of observation that the monasteries of Mount Athos, as well as those in other parts

of the Turkish empire, remained unharmed from the time of Mohammed the 2nd, to recent times, by the Turkish rulers and sovereign, a fact very singularly contrasted with the fate of similar religious establishments in other countries conquered by *Christian* princes.

The monasteries of the Princes Islands formerly were the most flourishing in Turkey. The four habitable islands are situated in a group of small islands, at the entrance of the Gulf of Nicomedia, in the sea of Marmora. These monasteries are now nearly abandoned by all their former monastic inmates, and have become places of pleasure and recreation in the summer months. The empty cloisters of one or two are trodden by a few pale and wretchedly poor monks, some deposed Patriarchs, and disgraced priors, or other subordinates of theirs, flitting through the sombre porches, and gliding along the deserted churches, like the ghosts of the former inmates.

The nearly ruined monasteries of Meteora (seven in number) of Thessaly are situated in the wildest part of Mount Pindus, many of them perched on the peaks of the mountains, on summits of precipitous rocks, the only access to which is by nets attached to ropes and pulleys, by means of which visitors are drawn up, or by ladders fixed to the rock. There are about sixty monks remaining in the ruins of those now dilapidated monasteries. These convents used to be employed for places of punishment, or detention of refractory monks, disgraced dignitaries of the Church, and as reformatories for youths of disorderly lives, the only condition being that the Greek communities should pay an annual sum of £28,000 sterling, which was allotted to the institution charged with the administration of the Greek funds. But this sum did not amount to a tenth part of the actual revenues of the Greek Church in Wallachia alone.

In 1848 the provisional government decreed the emancipation of those tributary monasteries, and appointed a commission to fix the amount of indemnity that ought to be paid to "the holy places," but the labours of this commission were cut short by

the fall of the provisional government, and things then went back to the old state, so that at the present time the total amount of the tribute paid by the principalities to the foreign monasteries may be estimated at £400,000 sterling, nearly a quarter of which amount goes to Mount Athos.

The other famous Greek monastery of Mount Sinai (likewise in Greece) derives a less share of these Moldo-Wallachian funds. This monastery is exceedingly austere. It contains about 100 monks, under a superior, styled archbishop, and head of Mount Sinai. The archbishop is chosen by election but receives by investiture from the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

In 1545, when Belou visited the Holy Mountain of Athos (less than a century after the Conquest), he found 6,000 caloyers or monks in the different monasteries, and of that number he states:—"It would be difficult to find more than two or three in each monastery who can read or write."

This was the state of things in all the monasteries I have visited in the Greek Islands, in European Turkey, in Syria and in Egypt. But amongst the few the very small minority of monks who could read and write in the monasteries I visited, there was generally one monk, sometimes two of the brotherhood, who were addicted to study, were acquainted with the Ancient Greek, had a knowledge of ecclesiastical history, and of the writings of the Greek fathers, and some acquaintance with the principal works or rarest manuscripts of their several libraries. Of the value of those monastic libraries we have abundant evidence in the accounts which the erudite travellers of France and Germany have given of them, and a recent English writer of acknowledged merit, the Hon. Robert Curzon.

Down to the period of the Greek revolution, and its termination in the Hellenic Kingdom, but especially the year 1821, the monasteries were unmolested by the Turks, consequently the library treasures remained uninjured, except by the ignorant members of their own communities. But the successes of the Greeks in the Morea, in 1821, led to irreparable mischief on the monastic libraries of several parts of Greece, and particularly

of the monasteries of Mount Athos at the hands of the infuriated Turks. Vast numbers of rare books, but far more valuable manuscripts, the loss of which never can be retrieved, were destroyed at that period.

Nearly a third of the monks of Mount Athos are annually employed in questing, and on those missions of mendicancy they are frequently absent for considerable periods. The monastic mendicant traveller who returns to his home on the sacred mount, with the best replenished scrip has the best chance at some future time of becoming prior or provisor. But the contributions thus obtained are not the chief means of subsistance of the monasteries. They derive considerable revenue from the fiscalized offerings which the orthodox churches of Greece and Russia annually send to the monastery of the Holy Mountain, and also from a fund raised for what are called "The Dedicated Churches of Wallachia and Moldavia," 28 in number, belonging to Mount Athos.

The total number of those dedicated churches is 102 in all regions, 53 for Wallachia, and 43 for Moldavia. The origin of these foundations is singular. Previously to the power of the Fanariote Greeks being established in Constantinople about the middle of the last century, there was a vast number of monasteries richly endowed, founded chiefly by the Greek Emperor and nobles of Greece.

The monks of Mount Athos in common with all the Greek clergy in Turkey are exempt from the Kharadji tax. But there is a tribute exacted from the monasteries, and collected by the Deflerdar of Karia, having a Mutecellum with twenty soldiers at his orders, who might visit the monasteries officially if the tribute was not paid in due time. But the Holy Mountain of Athos is exempt from the small, profane footprints of female visitors on pilgrimages of any kind. No daughter of Eve of any race or creed is allowed to ascend the sacred mount, or to wander amidst the monasteries of the precincts at its base either "by moonlight alone," or in company, or to come there at any time of day in the society of male pilgrims, lest per-

adventure they might not only inspire a kind of devotion which the good caloyers could not approve of, but profane the sanctity of their little monastic Goshen of orthodox purity, piety, and perfection.

The covetousness of the monasteries of the Greek monks brought on them the covetousness of the Greek Oligarchs of the Fanar. The Fanariotes cancelled the greater number of the original grants, and substituted for them new titles called "Chrysobulls," recognizing a portion of the formerly state-endowed monasteries as dedicated to the Greek communities of the Holy Sepulchre, Mount Sinai and Mount Athos. To these all the other religious foundations in the Turkish provinces were forced to contribute. The Hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia, and subsequently the national assemblies, frequently protested against this glaring injustice, by which in fact in favour of foreigners living in monasteries in Mount Athos, a fifth of the landed property of the Moldo-Wallachian Territory was alienated. The question has long been a violent as well as protracted controversy. In 1822, when the government of the Danubian provinces was returned to its native princes, a firman was obtained from the Porte, annulling the exorbitant pretensions of the Greek monks, and restoring the surplus ecclesiastical revenues of the principal to their legitimate owners. But the new arrangements made in 1831, when the Greeks were triumphant, were entirely in favour of the Greek Monastic pretensions.

The common grants made to them originally were connected with certain conditions, the employment, especially, of a portion of the funds in pious or charitable uses. In course of time, the conditions were forgotten, the pious and charitable objects fell into abeyance; the appropriation of funds to any other purposes but the uses of the monasteries, had even fallen into desuetude in the life time of some of the pious benefactors and founders of those religious houses. At the period of the power and influence of the Fanariotes, the covetousness or *necessitousness* of the Caloyers had led to an entire appropriation

of the portion of the monastic property that was solely applicable to pious or charitable uses. *The first departure from the rules of all monastic bodies, is attributable to the lust of land and the love of money.* The next departure from the spirit of their institute, and the abandonment of fundamental Christian principles, for sordid appetites for gain, the base grovelling nature of which it becomes the art and whole life aim of a false conscience to conceal, under a mask of zeal for the adornment or aggrandizement of religious houses, churches, and ceremonials, is occasioned by luxury, necessitating a policy of deception and hypocrisy.

One might address to the rulers of the Caloyers of "the Holy Mountain of Athos of those times, the words of Dante in the nineteenth Canto of the Inferno.

"Oh, Simon Magus, say, what led thy brain,
With gold the hallowed *mountain* to profane,
And tempt the wand'ring spouse of God to sin?
Your *sacred calling* claims a harsher lay,
High o'er your frontier hangs the lofty way,
And sees below your horrid lot begin."

* * *

"Then, lo, a later doom the prophet told,
But come seducer of the spouse of God,
Who ruled the Christian *Mount* with iron rod,
Come, thine eternal revenues behold."

* * *

"Say when Jesus grac'd
The humble fisher with the high command,
Did shining gold pollute his holy hand?
Follow my footsteps was his sole request,
Or from his station when Iscariot fell,
Did Peter's choice the chosen saint compel
To buy the empty seat for sums of gold,
Now bid the monarch dread his *sandalled* foe,
Go boast thy treasures to the fiends below,
And have thy wolves destroyed the *mountain* fold."

* * *

Lamented ever be that lib'ral hand
Whose gifts allured the apostolic band,
To leave the humble path where long they trod."*

* Bond's Translation of the Inferno, by Dante. Ed. 1785. Vol. 2, p. 185.

CHAPTER IV.

Proposed Re-union of the Greek and Latin Churches.

In 1850 the Abbé de St. Michou set out from France on an expedition to the East, unauthorised, however, by his spiritual superior, but as he states, animated by a strong desire and predominant impulse to be the means of effecting a union between the Heterodox Catholic Churches of the East, and the Orthodox Church of Rome. An account of this expedition, entitled "A Narrative of a Religious Journey in the East, in 1850 and 1851," was published in London in 1853. It appears that M. the Abbé de St. Michou accompanied a scientific oriental expedition to the East, set on foot by the French Government, at the head of which was a well known savant, M. de Sauley.

The Abbé de St. Michou, an enthusiastic French ecclesiastic, evidently of excellent intentions, but not of very remarkable intellectual powers, in the early part of 1850, seems to have arrived at the conclusion, that "the time was come for an attempt to reconcile the Orthodox Church of the East with the Church of Rome."

"Before setting out (says the author) I wished to ask the benediction upon my labours of the common Father of the Faithful. Since his accession to the Papacy, Pius IX. had entered into a correspondence with the Patriarchs of the Greek

and Armenian Churches. This attempt had failed. I shall explain the reason why the result was so unfortunate. I was convinced that such an important enterprise ought not to be abandoned in consequence of a first failure, the motives of which it would be easy to discover upon the spot.

"I addressed from Paris a memorial to his Holiness, short and comprehensive, in which I stated my thoughts, and the objects of my religious researches. Monseigneur the Nuncio Fornari, who was about to be raised to the dignity of a cardinal, granted me an audience, in which he listened to the details of my plan with the kindest cordiality. He entreated me to devote the journey I had in contemplation to the service of religion, and he promised to present to the Sovereign Pontiff the memorial which I had drawn up.

"'His Holiness, Pius IX.,' said the memorial, 'who more than any one in the Catholic world, has mourned over this isolation, and deplored the sad tendency of an age, which every day departs more and more from the faith, comprehends what happiness it would be for the universal Church, what a triumph for the doctrines of which she is the sacred depository, what glory for a pontificate of which the commencement has given so many hopes, if the reunion of Christian communion were prepared if not completed, by its high initiative.'

"The memorial continued as follows:—

"'These are the facts upon which are founded our hopes of the reunion of Christian communions separated from Rome since the sixteenth century. It therefore follows that an œcumenical council would easily remove the obstacles which have hitherto impeded so important a work, and would tend to accomplish a reconciliation destined to give so much splendour to the Church of Christ.

"'On the other hand, the East, separated for a still longer period, is languishing from day to day, without strength and without life, deprived of the energy which is at once given by authority and unity. The doctrinal points at issue between the two Churches are so easy to clear up, that in them lie the least

obstacles to a reunion. But the old prejudices of religious animosities which amount to fanaticism, and an ignorance of which it is difficult to form an idea, require great judgment in approaching the subject. It will require slow and well-considered preliminaries, not to wound their susceptibilities so long kept up by old antipathies. By wise precautions in carrying forward negociations, the work of the council of Florence may be resumed. It is impossible that the great Eastern churches should be fallen so low that they have not still some Bessarions sufficiently intelligent and upright to recognise the truth, and to co-operate with ardour in the reunion of these two churches.

"'As this reconciliation cannot be made without great caution, and the careful preparation of men's minds, it is desirable that those animated by the sincere wish of saving this noble cause should communicate with eminent men of the estranged communions, to sound them, and to suggest to them the immense advantages of this reunion, so that it is possible to combat revived prejudices, and to weaken antipathies which have their origin only in national pride.'

"I am ignorant whether my humble address, and my prayer of a child of the Church ever reached Pius IX.

"At Constantinople I called upon M. Hillereau, Archbishop of Pera, and Patriarchal vicar of the Latins.

"M. the Patriarchal Vicar received me with extraordinary kindness. In him I found a man of superior mind, who perfectly understood the religious question, and who spoke to me upon it at length, and with remarkable impartiality and great judiciousness. Among the difficulties in the way of bringing together an œcumenical council, M. Hillereau places that of making the Greeks come to it. They would not like to displease the Emperor of Russia, whose co-religionists they are. In case the œcumenical council were convened in any city of the East of Europe, he would convene one in his own dominions, and oppose the Orthodox Greek Church to the Catholic Church, which would render the schism still more violent. He owned, however, that this difficulty ought not to stop the projected

council; that several circumstances might arise and render the opposition of Russia less violent than is commonly supposed.

"I next visited the Abbé Antonio Marinelli, to the house of M. Hassoun, Archbishop and Primate to the Catholic Armenians. M. Hassoun is an Armenian from Constantinople. He is rich from family property, and from the revenues of his office.

"We discussed at length the great question of the œcumenical council. I saw that he fully understood its importance. He told me that he attached immense importance to the council, and that it would be a great blessing to Christianity could this project be realised.

"He had been elected about six or seven years ago, by the Armenian nation, as their spiritual and temporal chief, with the title of Patriarch; but the Propaganda of Rome did not authorize him to take the title officially, although it is always given to him. The Propaganda was perfectly right in this. We must not multiply in the East these titles, which will only create greater difficulties in the case of a union of the non-Catholic part of the Armenian nation.

"It is some time since he resigned his office as temporal chief. The person elected in his place, who takes the title of civil Patriarch, is a simple priest, with no hierarchical station. Commonly the Porte does not allow the temporal chiefs of different nations to be laymen.

"In his desire to advance religion among the Armenian Catholics, M. Hassoun had appointed from his most able priests, six bishops for the most important dioceses of the Catholic Patriarchate, in which, up to this time, there had been only simple vicarial administrators. He had consulted upon this point the Propaganda of Rome, who approved his project, and greatly applauded his zeal; but Rome and the worthy prelate had not foreseen that these bishops would experience from the dioceses to which they were appointed, so insurmountable an opposition, that they have been forced to renounce the thought of establishing themselves there. The Catholic population of

Armenia has contested M. Hassoun's right to impose bishops upon them without consulting them, and without the persons being submitted to their election according to canonical rules. From this it results that the step of the Patriarchal Vicar was a grave mistake; at Rome, where ideas of election receive little favour, the difficulty was not suspected. He is positive that it was not so great as to prevent him from trying to overcome the opposition of the nation and its clergy.

"I went afterwards to call upon the civil Patriarch of the Armenian Catholics. His name is Salvaini. He said there would be no difficulties in the way of a reunion of the Armenian nation, but that obstacles would come from the Greeks. He is persuaded that only an œcumenical council can bring about the reunion. He cited, as a case in point, the failure of the steps taken by Pius IX. at the commencement of his pontificate. His Holiness had sent to court in the month of November, 1847, M. Ferrieri, Archbishop of Sidon *in partibus*, in the quality of apostolical nuncio and visitor general of the East. The nuncio was the bearer of an encyclical letter from the Holy Father, in which he most earnestly entreated the Christians of the East to return to the Roman Church. This noble step of the pious pontiff, was generally attributed to the influence of Father Ventura. The Armenian Patriarch received the nuncio of the Pope in a friendly manner, and politely accepted the encyclical letter; but at his first visit he did not touch upon the great affair. A second visit was to be made, but the Armenian Patriarch refused to see them. The Greek Patriarch received the nuncio with coldness; he took the encyclical letter, and after his departure threw it into the fire, in the presence of bishops and priests. . . .

"*Reply of the Orthodox Eastern Church to the Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius IX., addressed by His Holiness in January, 1848, to the Orthodox Greek Christians.**

* This curious document translated into French, was published in Paris in 1850, by Klincksiech, Rue de Lille, No. 11. The original document is said to have issued from the Patriarchate Press at Constantinople, under the auspices of the Patriarch, and therefore may be considered an exposition of the Greek Orthodox doctrine.

"The Orthodox Eastern Church, in spite of all the storms which have disturbed her for many centuries, and even do to the present time,—in spite of all the sufferings she has had to undergo, and her struggles against various temptations, still survives. She has undergone vicissitudes, and endured aggressions, but by the visible protection of her invisible Protector, she is kept firmly upon the immovable rock of the faith.

THESIS I.

"The blessed Pope, Pius IX., after having spoken at some length in his encyclical letter to those who have constantly continued in the communion and faith of his see, addresses to all the Orthodox Eastern Christians some words of peace and love (as he says), and of anxiety for those of us who, although we worship Jesus Christ, are yet alienated from the see of St. Peter. He adds that, after the example of Christ, he wishes to bring back the lost sheep into the Lord's fold. Addressing those who discharge the high ecclesiastical functions (not, however mentioning the name of Patriarch), he reminds them of the ancient state of our Churches, when they were closely connected with the other Churches in the world, and asks them what benefit they have found in the dissensions which have arisen up in consequence of this separation, and have brought it to pass that the pastors of the East differ on the subject of doctrine, and sacred authority, not only from the Churches of the West, but also from one another?

REPLY.

"The Eastern Church, its pastors, and all orthodox Christians, return thanks to Pius IX., for his anxiety to bring back the lost sheep into the fold. It is, indeed, a sacred duty incumbent upon his Eminence to recall the thousands who have separated from Rome, and have broken off their union with her. But in the case of the orthodox Eastern Christians, his zeal is entirely

misplaced. For he himself is well acquainted with the ancient union in which the two sisters were, for eight consecutive centuries, connected by the same spirit and by the same profession of faith. Nor is he either ignorant of the grounds—not frivolous but weighty ones (because a Divine truth was then at stake), in consequence of which the Western Church, by persisting in her innovations, broke the sacred bond which united her to the Eastern, while the latter made no alteration in her primitive institutions, neither before nor after the change of her political position—a providential arrangement. She preserves, unaltered, her ancient character; the clergy discharge the duties incumbent upon their respective orders; the holy sacraments are everywhere administered; and in one word, the Eastern Church has firmly kept, and still keeps, unchanged, and in their primitive purity, all the doctrines she has received from the apostles themselves and the holy fathers, who were divinely inspired; she has made no innovation upon these doctrines; she will maintain them for ever, without contention, curtailment, or division, in points of doctrine and pastoral union; although she is undeservedly slandered, and reproached with doing the contrary.

THESIS II.

"Farther on, in his encyclical letter, Pius IX bids the Eastern Christians remember the Creed and the one holy Catholic (universal) and apostolic Church, which they refuse to acknowledge, when they deny that the Roman Church is such.

REPLY.

"The members of the Catholic and orthodox Eastern Church receive and revere the sacred summary of those truths which are contained in sound and pure doctrine. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his 18th homily to the catechumens, treating upon the sacred creed, says: "The church is called Catholic, because it extends throughout the universe; and because Catholic

doctrine, in all its points, and with no omissions, is taught within its bosom. The Church, therefore, which contains all truths, with no omissions, and without the least alteration, is one and holy, by reason of the unity and holiness of its only head—our Lord Jesus Christ. The pastors of the primitive apostolical Church under the government of this head, together with the Churches which were lawfully subordinate to them, and with others which remained independent, lived in peaceable union and unanimity. So also by the purity of faith, and by observance of the canons of the apostles and councils, do all the Orthodox Eastern Christians form a well organised body—a holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

THESIS III.

"In the next place to establish the sovereignty of the Bishops of Rome, the usual arguments are advanced in this letter, such as, 1st, The gift of the keys to the Apostle Peter; 2nd, The indefectibility of his faith; 3rd, The command to strengthen his brethren; and 4th, To feed the sheep of Jesus Christ.

REPLY.

"The words addressed by our Lord Jesus Christ, to St. Peter —'Thou art Peter, &c.,' were equally so to the other apostles. 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven' (Matt. xviii. 18). The words, 'On this rock will I build my Church,' were equally said of all the apostles, and even of the prophets. 'Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets' (Ephes. ii. 20). 'And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb' (Rev. xxi. 14). Now the words just quoted lead us to the conclusion that Jesus Christ alone is the chief stone in the foundation of the apostles, and of the whole Church. 'Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone' (Ephes. ii. 20). It is true that it was to St. Peter that the

Lord said: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church' (Matt. xvi. 18); but it was only because St. Peter anticipated the other apostles in this confession: 'Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." As to the sense of the words, 'And upon this rock I will build my Church,' St. Augustine (besides the Eastern fathers) explains them as follows:—'Thou art Peter,' says Christ, 'and upon this rock that thou hast confessed, upon this rock that thou hast acknowledged, by saying, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God," I will build my Church; it is not upon thine own self, but indeed upon me that thou mayest build the Church, which is my body.' But those who wished to lay their foundation upon men said, 'As for me, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos and I of Cephas' (1 Cor. i. 12). Now the exposition of the blessed Western father shows us, in the first place, that the rock upon which the Church was founded is not the Apostle Peter, but the Apostle's confession of faith—Jesus Christ himself. 'That rock was Christ' (1 Cor. x. 4); in the second place, that those who persist in saying: 'I am of Cephas (of Peter); it is Peter that I respect exclusively, and acknowledge as the head of all the holy fathers, and of the Church herself,'—those men, in the words of St. Paul and of St. Augustine, divide Christ, and build upon a human foundation.

"As to the special prayer of Christ for Peter, that his faith might no more fail; 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren' (Luke xxii. 32), the fathers gave very clear explanations upon this point; as Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Macarius, Ægyptus, Titus, of Bostra, Theophylact, and Cyril, of Alexandria. Jesus Christ, in his wonderful prayer to his heavenly Father, which we read in the seventeenth chapter of St. John, prayed generally for all the apostles, and for those that should believe on him through their word. If then he prayed for Peter especially, it was because he foresaw that even he who uttered these presumptuous words: 'Though all

men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended' (Matt. xxvi. 33), would deny his master, and thus deeply fall. But after this, having too much confidence in his own strength, and after having broken the promise he had made, fear took hold of him, and he was guilty of denying his master. Christ prayed, not that the faith of Peter might not waver (for this had already come to pass, as a punishment for his presumptuous words), but that it might not entirely fail and die, so far as to reduce him to despair in consequence of his denial; and that Peter, having washed away his sin by repentance, and been converted to his former faith, might become a salutary example of restoration for all other brethren whose faith might waver.

"Immediately after the above words were uttered by the Lord, not to show the supremacy of St. Peter, but to preserve him from the despair which the enormous sin he had committed might reduce him (a truth which is well set forth by the fathers, and is self-evident), the encyclical letter, to justify the power that the Bishops of Rome have arrogated to themselves, advanced the ordinary arguments, in a well-known order, which the Eastern Church has centuries ago triumphantly refuted in writing.

THESIS IV.

"Jesus Christ expressly charged St. Peter to feed his lambs and sheep; he therefore entrusted to his care the whole Church, which consists of true lambs and sheep of Jesus Christ, and this care now devolves upon the sovereign pontiffs of Rome, &c.

REPLY.

"To explain this point, we think it will be enough to say as follows:—The threefold question, addressed by our Lord to St. Peter, is a command rather than anything else; for this reason no allusion is made to any power, but to a sacred duty, strictly laid upon all the Lord's ministers. 'Feed the flock of God

which is among you ' (1 Peter v. 2). Let those who pretend that in this command given to St. Peter, there is a reference to some mysterious prerogative, consult the works of the holy fathers, Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and Cyril, of Alexandria; they will then see what meaning the fathers put on these words.

" For the sake of brevity we will cite here only the words of the first-mentioned of these fathers. St. Augustine says, by the thrice-repeated confession of St. Peter: ' Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee,' the sin of the threefold denial is blotted out, and the apostolate of St. Peter is restored; this was done to remove the idea that might be entertained that the apostolate would be weakened by the denial into which Peter fell from the frailty of human nature. With this explanation before our eyes, we must read the sacred words of the gospel in the sense of the old fathers of the Church. Jesus says to Simon Peter: ' Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?' that is, Do you who formerly boasted and said—' Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended,'—do you, I say, love me more than the other apostles? Peter, properly taught by painful experience, no longer dares tell Jesus that he loves him more than the other apostles, but he says in reply only: ' Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.' Jesus Christ having received this humble answer, does not keep on requiring more love from Peter than from the rest—a thing which Peter had formerly boasted of—but simply asks him of love. ' Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?' To this Peter humbly gave the same answer; but having been questioned the third time, Peter remembered his threefold denial, and was, not without reason, grieved. ' Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, " Lovest thou me " ' (John xxi. 17). It follows, consequently, that St. Peter saw in this triple interrogation, not any prerogative, but rather a humiliation, remorse for his denial being in his mind.

" In like manner the threefold command of our Lord to St. Peter: ' Feed my lambs and my sheep,' is not a summary

charge to rule the Church, nor any other extraordinary commission, as the supporters of Rome take it to be, by explaining this saying in a very arbitrary manner. To bring out the truth more clearly, we will quote the testimony of the Western fathers, and in the first place, that of St. Ambrose. 'The Apostle Peter,' he says, 'after his fall, which proceeded from the weakness of human nature, was thrice questioned, because of his threefold denial. The first question, 'Lovest thou me?' is an allusion to his love before the cross; the second, to his love for the flock; and the third is the expression of the pardon of his sin (De Sac. lib. ii. c. 7).' In the second place, we shall cite the following passage of St. Augustine: 'Thrice fear denied, thrice love confessed.' Would you know the meaning of the Lord's command, 'Feed my sheep?' know then that to feed is to teach and nourish with spiritual food (Homil. V. in Evang. Joh.) Such, then, is the explanation of the fathers, such the interpretation of this passage which is given by the primitive Catholic and Orthodox Church.

"A passage of St. Irenæus (Contra. Hær. lib. iii. c. 4.) is afterwards quoted in the encyclical letter, and arbitrarily mutilated.

THESIS V.

"St. Irenæus, in appealing to the doctrine of the Apostles against the heretics of his age, considers that it is useless to enumerate the traditions of all the churches which have an apostolic origin, but asserts that it is enough to cite against them the doctrine of the Roman Church, and says the whole Church, that is, all the faithful in the whole world, must rally round the Church of Rome on account of the pre-eminence of this Church, in which the traditions received from the Apostles have been preserved on all matters believed by the faithful.

REPLY.

"The words of St. Irenæus against the Gnostic heretics, in their original and unaltered text, are as follows: 'As it would

be too long (but not useless as the Pope has it) to enumerate the traditions of all the churches, we shall silence any one who carries his speculations beyond due bounds, no otherwise than by considering the tradition of the Apostles and the faith preached to men; and come down to our days, as it has been preserved in the great, ancient, and well-known Church, established at Rome by the two illustrious Apostles, Peter and Paul (not by Peter only). With this Church, on account of its very firm foundation, the whole Church must agree, that is to say, the faithful in all the world, for there has ever been preserved, down to my time, the traditions of the Apostles.'

"In what a pitiful manner have the words of the holy father been mutilated! The words—'the whole Church must agree,' (the mutilators leaving out the context) have been transformed into the following—'the faithful must rally round the Church of Rome on account of its pre-eminence.' This pre-eminence was not then invented, and the blessed Irenæus knew nothing about it. Having to argue with the Gnostics, he addressed the Churches of the West subordinated to Rome, and combatting these heretics with the ancient tradition, that is to say, with the tradition given to all the Churches by the Apostles. St. Irenæus passes by in silence other Churches on account of their great number, and refers only to the Church of Rome, in the patriarchate of which he was a bishop. There was then no other sovereign city. The Church of ancient Rome had the primacy of honor over the Western Churches subordinated to her, and on this account is mentioned by Irenæus. Further, the holy father cites in the same chapter not only the Church of Rome, but also those of Ephesus and Smyrna. Had he acknowledged the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome only, he would, in his controversy with the Gnostics, have cited only this Church, without mentioning any other. But he acknowledged the other churches as equals of Rome, and as of the same authority; for this reason he, together with the neighbouring bishops, induced Pope Victor not to excommunicate the Christians of Asia, and, at the same time, rebuked him for

having done so on account of a difference in the celebration of Easter, and not to make a schism in the churches on such an unimportant difference.

"At the time when the two Churches of the East and the West were united together, as much by purity of doctrine as by Christian love and union; at this time, we say, the bishops of the Eastern Church, more than once, when unjust attacks were made upon them, solicited help from the pious Bishops of Rome, whom they looked upon as primates, in respect of their see and precedence. However, after the schism of the two Churches, the Bishops of Rome, with undue presumption, and no longer content with the *primacy* of their position, presumed to arrogate *supremacy* over the whole Church. On this account, in page 9 of the encyclical letter, directly after the passage of St. Irenæus just cited, it is set forth as a very important argument for the supremacy of the Bishops of Rome, that the Eastern Bishops have solicited help at their hands; and, first of all, Athanasius the Great, of whom it is said:"

THESIS VI.

"Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, when he was unjustly condemned and driven from his see, came to Rome. Now Julius, Bishop of Rome, took cognizance of each man's case (for other bishops, unjustly driven by the Arians from their sees, likewise came to Rome), and having found them all faithful to the Nicene Creed, because they thought the same as he did, he admitted them to communion. And as by reason of the pre-eminence of the Holy See, the care of all is incumbent upon him, he restored them to their Churches, &c."

REPLY.

"Athanasius the Great, who suffered so much for religion, after he had been calumniated and condemned by the Arian

bishops, headed by his sworn enemy, Eusebius of Nicomedia, repaired to Rome to Constantine, Emperor of the West, and to Pope Julius, for he knew that the Roman Church was opposed to the Arians, and preserved in its integrity the Creed of Nicæa. And did Julius, when he pleaded the cause of Athanasius, who was unjustly condemned, express himself to the orthodox and Arians as their head in terms like these:—'This is the will of the Church of Rome, by reason of the keys of St. Peter,' or in other terms equally presumptuous? on the contrary, he wrote to them modestly, and showed himself mindful of the union between the Churches. To prove the unlawful consecration of Gregory as the successor of Athanasius, he does not say that the sanction of the Pope ought, first of all to have been asked, and only after that ought Athanasius to be deprived and Gregory to be ordained, but he simply says that the Eastern Church would have done well to have conferred with the Western on this matter, that all might have together decided what was required by justice, seeing that those who were unjustly dealt with were bishops of churches which had been founded by the apostles in person. Pope Julius, moreover, says in respect of this letter to the Eastern Church, that he wrote it in pursuance of a decision of a council held at Rome. 'For,' he says, 'although I alone have signed the letter, the opinion is not mine alone, but that also of the other bishops of Italy and the neighbouring countries.' And as in this letter Julius considers not himself but the council as the judge, no conclusion in favour of ecclesiastical supremacy can be deduced therefrom, nor as to the right of supreme jurisdiction. (Athanas. Apol. 2, Socrates, and others.) In one word, it was not the Bishop of Rome that restored Athanasius to his see, and permitted him to return to Alexandria, but Constantine, through the entreaties and even threats on the part of Constance. (Socrates, lib. 2.)

"After this, the encyclical letter says as follows of St. Chrysostom:

THESIS VII.

"John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, who was wrongfully condemned by the council of Chalcedon, had recourse to the Apostolic See by letters and envoys, and was acquitted, our predecessor Innocent I. having proved his innocence.

REPLY.

"St. John Chrysostom, that man of God, having been deprived of his see by the council which was convoked by wicked men, at a villa near Chalcedon, called The Oak, wrote concerning these unjust attacks against him (but he never sent legates), not only to Pope Innocent, but also to other bishops, such as Flavian of Antioch, John of Jerusalem, Eulogius of Antioch, Theodosius of Scythopolis, to the bishops of Macedonia, and last of all to Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage in Africa. (Sozomen, lib. 8, c. 24. Chrysostom's Letters, 37, 91, 95.) Innocent, who was solicited by Chrysostom to convene an œcumenical council to inquire into the calumnies of which he was the victim and to pronounce judgment after inquiry, did all he could to convoke an œcumenical council; but all his efforts notwithstanding the concurrence of Honorius, Emperor of the West, had no result. The envoys whom the Pope sent to Byzantium, became embroiled with some members of the court of Arcadius and Eudoxia, and were sent back in disgrace, as though they had come only to trouble a foreign government. St. Chrysostom they succeeded in banishing to a greater distance, viz., to Pityus, in Colchis. (Letter 2 of Chrys. to Innocent. Sozom., lib. 6, last chapter.) This is the true account, founded upon and attested by good evidence; it will be seen that it differs greatly from the Roman version of the matter, which has been taken from false histories, and altered facts. This account shows us then that the holy father

wrote about what had happened to him not only to the Bishop of Rome, but also to other bishops, and that both Chrysostom and Innocent (and nothing can be clearer than this) acknowledge the supreme authority of the œcumenical council which they endeavoured to convoke.

"In order to establish more fully the absolute supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, from their primacy in question, the encyclical letter, by way of supplement to what has been before said in it, puts forth the following:

THESIS VIII.

"Another example of the respect of your fathers for the supremacy of the Bishops of Rome, is met with in the council of Chalcedon (451). The bishops assembled there, about six hundred in number, who, with some few exceptions, belonged to the East; after the letters (read the letter) from Leo the Great, Sovereign Pontiff of Rome, had been read, cried out in the second act of the council: 'It is St. Peter has thus spoken by the mouth of Leo,' &c.

REPLY.

"The letter of Pope Leo to the fourth œcumenical council which was convened at Chalcedon, though quite orthodox, had notwithstanding to undergo a mature examination, whether it were or were not in conformity with the creed of the first and second œcumenical councils, and also with the profession of faith made by St. Cyril at the third œcumenical council, as is shown by the acts of the above-mentioned fourth council. After the deliberations upon the letter were finished, Anatolius of Constantinople having been asked whether it were orthodox and in agreement with the decrees of the œcumenical councils, replied that it fully agreed both with the creeds of the 318 and 150 fathers, and with that decreed upon by St. Cyril at the council of Ephesus. So you see that it was not from Leo's

letter, which the father had examined, that judgment was pronounced upon the heresy of Eutyches, and an end put to the troubles which it had called forth, but from the decrees of the councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus. Now which is superior, he who is examined and judged, or he who examines and judges? Leo, although an orthodox and holy man, said nothing in his letter to the council concerning his headship, but only set forth in his profession of faith what the fathers had already said in the preceding councils. It is therefore utterly impossible to deduce from it any conclusion in favour of the absolute supremacy, as the Romans imagine can be done, when they fall back upon the letter of St. Leo to the fourth council. If this letter has been called the pillar of orthodoxy, the letters of the eastern bishops to their Patriarch, Tarasius, were equally called by the fathers at the seventh œcumenical council, "the pillar of piety,' as the letter of Tarasius to the eastern bishops was called 'the rule of orthodoxy.' Now the pillar of orthodoxy, the pillar of piety, and the rule of orthodoxy, are one and the same thing.

When the fathers at the fourth council requested that the letter from St. Cyril of Alexandria might be read, and the letter had been read, the council exclaimed: 'So does St. Cyril believe so do we believe; may the memory of St. Cyril live for ever!' Then, when St. Leo's letter had also been read, the fathers exclaimed again: 'This is the faith of the fathers of the church; it is that of the Apostles. So Peter hath spoken by the mouth of Leo.' Thereupon they added: 'Thus did the Apostles teach.' All this proves plainly, that the fathers acknowledged Leo as orthodox, on account of the perfect agreement between his creed and the doctrine of Cyril. Now Cyril's letter having given no supremacy to Cyril, neither did Leo's letter give any to Leo.

THESIS IX.

"The Bishops of Rome obtained the first rank in the councils, and especially in the œcumenical councils, and their authority

was appealed to, both before and after the institution of councils. We might, independently of councils, cite several other acts and writings of the fathers and ancient eastern writers, which prove that the supremacy of the Bishops of Rome was firmly established in the East in the time of your ancestors, &c. (page 10).

REPLY.

"In the first place, not one of the seven œcumenical councils was convened by the pretended power of the sovereign pontiffs of Rome, to which (as Catholics say) recourse would have been had either before or after the convocation of the councils; but, as is shown both by the acts and history of the councils, these sacred assemblies were convened expressly and particularly by the supreme authority and absolute power of the orthodox emperors of the East, who summoned the bishops both of the East and West to take part in the councils, either in person, or by their representatives. To prove that the consent of the Pope was never required before convening the œcumenical councils, and that the legates of the Bishops of Rome did not attend the council as invested with supreme power, but did so with submission, we think the following facts will suffice. The legates whom Pope Agatho sent to the sixth œcumenical council said to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus: 'Sire: in pursuance of the order issued by your Majesty to our very Holy Pope, we are sent to you, under the protection of God, as the bearers of a communication from His Holiness.' This communication was in these terms:—'In consequence of a pious order of your clemency, under the protection of God, out of obedience to which we are bound, and not from boldness, we send you our fellow-labourers; and kneeling in spirit before you, we humbly entreat your clemency to honour them with a gracious welcome.' (First Act of the 6th Council.) Pope Adrian, when he sent his legates to the seventh œcumenical council, wrote as follows to the Emperor Constantine and to Irene:—'Most pious and benignant sovereigns, it is with very cordial love that I entreat

your kindness, and as though I did so in person, kneeling before you, and falling at your feet, I beseech, exhort, and conjure you, in the presence of God, to restore the holy images, and to let them be worshipped according to the ancient rule, in the capital and in both parts of Greece. (Act 2 of the 7th Council.)

As to the supremacy which has caused so much noise and discussion, to which the Bishop of Rome makes such great pretensions, which he so far elevates and exalts as to threaten those who dispute it, we may truly say that it cannot be proved from the works of the Eastern fathers, and that the Eastern Church has never acknowledged it, notwithstanding what the Bishops of Rome say on the point. According to the conclusive canons of the seven œcumenical councils, held before the schism of the churches, the Eastern Church, its chief bishop, and its four orthodox patriarchs, awarded nothing to the Bishops of Rome, excepting the primacy of honour, but connected therewith no idea of primacy or sovereignty over the whole Christian Church.

"The sixth canon of the first œcumenical council says as follows:—'Let the ancient customs received in Egypt, Lybia, and at Pantapolis, be maintained, according to which the Bishop of Alexandria has authority over all the bishops of these countries The Bishop of Rome has a similar prerogative. The prerogatives conferred upon churches of Antioch, as well as of other places, are likewise to be maintained.'

"The canon we have just cited shows us very plainly the authority of the Bishop of Rome was, in all respects, equal to that of the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and other sees. From this it is clear that the first œcumenical council was far from acknowledging, in the Bishop of Rome, the power of absolute supremacy over the universal church, or, what comes to the same thing, the dignity of the head of the church.

The third canon of the second œcumenical council prescribes —"Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the primacy of honour, after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome. Admitting that, it might be asked whether the Bishop of Rome has simply the primacy of honour, and no

supreme and universal authority. We must, then, be very attentive to the meaning of the canon of the council according to which the Bishop of Constantinople follows immediately after the Bishop of Rome. The cause is, that Constantinople is New Rome. Why, then, does the Bishop of Rome take precedence over the Bishop of Constantinople? Because he is Bishop of ancient Rome. From this it may, therefore, be concluded, that the second council awarded to the Bishop of Rome the prerogative of antiquity, and not an exclusive power.

"After having established the ancient rights and independence of the Bishops of Cyprus and of other bishops, which had been violated, and limited the power of each to their respective episcopates, giving them no right to extend it beyond those limits, the third æcumenical council, to prevent similar abuses in future, decreed as follows:—'Let not the order of the fathers be infringed upon; let not the arrogance of temporal power creep in by stealth, under pretence of sacred acts, so far as to deprive us, little by little, without our perceiving it, of the liberty that the liberator of all men, our Lord Jesus Christ, has mercifully given us, at the cost of his blood. (Can. viii.)

The sacred council, therefore, instead of approving or admitting the absolute authority of bishops (such as Roman Church attributes to the Pope,) on the contrary, expressly rejected it. Nor did the council fail to take great care that a like arrogance of authority should not, in time, show itself among the pastors of the church.

The twenty-eighth canon of the fourth œcumenical council says: "Observing in all things the decrees of the holy fathers, and acknowledging the canon of the 550 pious bishops which has just been read (the third in the second council), we appoint and accord the same privileges to the most holy Church of Constantinople, the new Rome. For the fathers with reason, accorded to the see of ancient Rome the privileges that she enjoys, because it was the seat of government. For the same reason the 550 bishops of the second general council determined that New Rome, which has the honour of being the seat of empire and

the senate, should have the same advantages in the order of the Church, and be the second to it. (Labbé, tom. iv. p. 769).

"According to the decree of this council, we must equally pay attention, in the first place to the fact that the sacred council, although awarding certain prerogatives to the Bishop of Rome, solely on account of the importance of this city, does not acknowledge in him, however, the extraordinary power of which this bishop presumptuously boasts in our times; in the second place, that the second as well as the third œcumenical council accorded to the see of New Rome the same prerogatives as to the ancient see. Hence it follows, that if the Bishop of Rome obtained precedency and the primacy of honour over the Bishop of Constantinople, it was only because it would be impossible for these two bishops each to be first at the same time, not because the Bishop of Rome had any prerogative of authority, or of particular and exclusive power, in respect to the Universal Church. The Bishop of Constantinople, therefore, exercised the same power in New Rome, as the Bishop of Rome in the ancient city. The same thing must be said of the three other Patriarchs of the Eastern Church, who, when they were together at councils, and in some other cases, always gave to the Bishops of Rome and of Constantinople, the primacy of position and of precedence, but of nothing else.

"Having republished what had been already ordered and decreed by the foregoing councils, concerning the sees of the Patriarch, the sixth œcumenical council adds, in its thirty-sixth canon:—'in republishing what was ordained by the 550 fathers assembled in this seat of government, which has been preserved by God, as well as by the 630 fathers assembled at Chalcedon, we decree that the see of Constantinople has the same prerogative as the see of ancient Rome; and that, as it is the second see, it takes the lead, like the former, in ecclesiastical matters; and that after it, in the following order, come, the see of the great city of Alexandria, that of Antioch, and lastly that of Jerusalem.

"In compliance with this decree of the council, the Bishop of Constantinople, as is the Eastern custom, is called Patriarch; and the Bishop of Rome, according to the custom of the Western Church, is called Pope; as the Bishop of Alexandria, according to ancient custom, is also called Pope.

"Let any man who wishes to be impartial, fall back upon the decisive arguments we have just set forth, which have been taken from the œcumenical councils, at which were present, or took part, either by word of mouth or by consent, the blessed Popes of that time, and himself judge how far it is from the truth that the pretended supremacy would have had any force in the East, with our holy fathers, or, which comes to the same thing, in these œcumenical councils. But Rome has formed a habit, which is a favourite and common one with her, of understanding things in an unusual way, and according to her own will of interpreting things falsely, and altering their sense.

"A like primacy—either as a head of the Church, as an absolute authority, or as a centre of true faith—was, therefore, never known or acknowledged in the person of a bishop by the Christian Church, considering that the bishops of the primitive Church are known to have had always in mind the words of the Lord: 'Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant' (Matt. xx. 26, 27). And as every bishop in obedience to this divine commandment, acknowledged himself as the servant of his brethren, no one, during the lifetime of the apostles and the apostolic fathers, ever dreamt of primacy or supremacy over the others. Moreover, the Churches of the most illustrious cities of that time, in which were a greater number of believers, and especially the bishops of the Churches whose succession was traced back to the apostles, acquired over other neighbouring but less famous Churches such prerogatives as made them a kind of refuge for them. Of this kind were the Churches of Antioch, the bishops of which were ordained by the Apostles Peter and Paul; of Alexandria, founded by the

Evangelist Mark; and of Rome, founded by the Apostles Peter and Paul together. Then the order of the œcumenical councils required one of the three bishops of the illustrious Churches we have just mentioned to have the primacy of honour, and that precedence should be granted to him. On this account, in accordance with the canon of the council, the fathers did not err in granting the primacy to the see of ancient Rome as the seat of government. We, holding steadfastly to the words of the canon, of the fourth œcumenical council just quoted: 'The fathers have given the primacy,' do not hesitate to add as an indisputable conclusion, that these prerogatives were given to the Bishops of Rome neither by the Apostles, nor by the Lord himself. And since the body of Roman bishops can nowise be acknowledged as the Church of Christ, that Church cannot either accept them as its head; for, from the words of Holy Writ, and according to the expression of St. Paul, no one, besides Jesus Christ can be chief and head of the Church (Ephes. iv. 8—15).

"And as the Romans, to prove the supremacy of the Popes, bring forward the epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians—we must say that this proves nothing. For in ancient times, as we have already said, the Churches with the fewest believers, applied in matters of faith and controversy, and in dissensions, to the bishops of the most illustrious cities. Now of this kind was the Church of Rome, not, however, by virtue of the right which its bishops arrogate to pronounce a final decision upon the affairs of the whole Christian Church—a right, which being only of recent invention, was not known in the Church of the second century.

"St. Clement, of Rome, addressed to Corinth an admonition which tended to put an end to the evil, and to lead the Corinthians to live in peace and unanimity. Dionysius, thè famous bishop of Corinth, under Antoninus Verus, a holy man, a disciple of the apostolical fathers, distinguished for his erudition and untiring activity,—he also, not to mention several other bishops, wrote to several churches, and thus made him-

self most useful to foreign churches. His instructions and epistles were resplendent with great erudition; and excited in many Churches a desire to ask him for other epistles, as he supplied not milk, but strong meat. In the primitive times of the Christian Church, therefore, divinely inspired men did not address epistles of this kind to the Churches from ambition, but in obedience to the words of the divine apostle, for the edification and perfection of the Lord's flock scattered abroad. (Ephes. iv. 12.)

THESIS X.

"We, children of the Eastern Church, thank His Holiness for his earnest invitations to us to be converted without delay, and unite ourselves to his see, which he believes to be the true foundation of the real Christian Church.

REPLY.

"In the first place, we assert that the Christian Church, from its institution, has never acknowledged nor does acknowledge at present (as we have sufficiently shown above), St. Peter, nor any man as the foundation. It acknowledges Jesus Christ as the first stone of the foundation. 'For other foundation can no man lay than that which is Jesus Christ.'—(1 Cor. iii. 11).

"In the second place, the encyclical letter says that the Easterns voluntarily separated themselves from the firm rock on which the Church of Rome has been built: that is to say, that the Church of the East has separated herself from that of the West.

"But for this to be said with justice and truth, proofs ought to have been given, that the Church of Rome, after the schism of the Churches, has remained as pure as at its origin, and that the Eastern Church has infringed upon some important and unchangeable law of the one holy Catholic Church. But as

nothing has been said upon this point we pass on. In considering both Churches at the time of their union, or rather, in considering the Catholic (universal) Church, in the first eight centuries, we find that to preserve its unity and integrity precisely and surely, she referred to a sacred law the following rule:—In general, orthodoxy in faith, and in the canonical institution of the Catholic (universal) Church is attested by the word of God, by means of the general consent of the Church and the fathers; as to particular Churches, they can themselves arrange their special matters, regarding only ecclesiastical discipline elsewhere; but they must not be bold, otherwise the basis of Christianity would be shaken. Upon this sacred law were the œcumenical councils immovably based, which would not even have been convened had such a law had no existence.

"Let us now, then, go through all the eight centuries of the one holy Catholic Church, till the schism of the two Churches took place, and let us look whether the sacred law of the Catholic (universal) Church, of which we have just spoken, is still preserved; if so, in which of the two Churches which are no longer united together, this law possesses all its force.

"On attentively looking at the Church of Rome, we see there in the foreground a new creed put forth by the council which was convened at Trent, in Germany, in 1545, under Pope Paul III.; a creed which not only departs from the faith it professes, but which is opposed, in almost every point to the profession of the ancient Catholic (universal) Church, and to the sacred creed of the two first œcumenical councils of Nicæa and Constantinople. After the unjustifiable addition ('filioque') to an ancient divine doctrine which the Tridentine creed has made, in spite of the positive words of the Gospel, which were uttered by Jesus Christ, who is God, there follow in this creed much new and unjustifiable doctrine; such strange ordinances as cannot even be traced in the ancient creed which deserves all our respect, but which are the work of a rash passion for innovation. The following are the innovations:—1. I acknowledge the true sacrament by which Jesus Christ is wholly received in

one kind. 2. I believe in the power of indulgences to remit sin, a power bestowed upon the Church by Jesus Christ, and I acknowledge that they have a wholesome use for mankind. 3. I promise absolute submission to the Pontiff of Rome, successor of St. Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ; and this I swear, so help me God!

"Such are the innovations—such are the new articles of faith,—which, though opposed to the ancient creed, the Westerns have arbitrarily established, but which they, however, pretend were framed by an œcumenical council, as they falsely call that of Trent; for they forgot, that from the time when Christians were divided into two distinct parties, there is no such thing as an œcumenical council; and no council can be called so which is not called together with the unanimous consent of the whole Church; it follows *à fortiori*, that Trent was not such a council even of the Western Church, because it was then troubled and shaken by a violent storm—Luther having upset and rent it. The Eastern Church, having seen the Western adopt such innovations, and, if we may be allowed to say so, depart from the ancient and sacred creed of the Orthodox faith, and from the doctrines set forth in the Word of God —doctrines that the Western Church had herself, together with the Eastern, reverenced and professed without the least alteration for upwards of eight centuries—the Eastern Church, we repeat, with its bishops and all the orthodox, were in suspense in the presence of such facts; she was surprised that the blessed Pope, at a period of general disorder, should have determined to enter upon a matter of this kind—to bring back to communion with his see the Eastern Church, which from its origin to the present time, believes and celebrates the holy sacraments with unchangeable agreement and unanimity, which keeps the pure and sacred doctrines of divine faith, as she has received them, unchanged, untouched, unvarying, ever the same, and with no innovation. How could the Holy Father propose to a nation which was the first Pagan people to embrace Christianity—to abandon the traditions of the fathers,—which was

first named after the name of Christ; which suffered so much for her holy religion before the taking of Constantinople (as history, ever impartial, tells us), and which has had afterwards so much to undergo from Rome and her missionaries, who were sent, as was said, to propagate religion. These missionaries used all their efforts to unsettle the faith of this nation—its sacred heritage from the holy fathers; fallacies, false teaching, insinuating conversations, pamphlets, and even calumnies as at the present time, wrongs and expedients of every kind,—everything has been tried, and nothing has succeeded. The Westerns have tried in vain; the nation of which we speak, in spite of all its vicissitudes, has remained firm in its belief; it has not overstepped the limits prescribed by the holy fathers: it has not submitted to any senseless addition to its holy doctrine; on the contrary, it has preserved, firmly and unchangeably, the doctrine and tradition of the Apostles, conformably to the canons and decrees made and issued under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, by the fathers of the East and West, at the seven œcumenical councils.

"The Eastern Church, by her bishops and all the orthodox, has already sufficiently explained herself, when she was invited to abandon the holy creed, separate herself from the sacred doctrine, and adopt the doctrines of Rome, the innovations of Trent, which are opposed to the sacred creed, and which have separated the Western Church not only from the Eastern, but also from the Orthodox Church of ancient Rome. In fine, an enormous chasm has been put between the two Churches—between the Eastern Church and her sister in times past, the Western Church; and it will remain as long as the innovations of the Church of Rome are unhealed, and especially on this addition ('filioque'), which is the worst of all:—as long, in fact, as that Church, by persisting in her innovations, remains irreconcileable to the Orthodox Church.

"At the end of his reply, the Eastern Church implores our God and Lord Jesus Christ—her chief, and the rock of her faith—to heal the wounds inflicted on the Church of Rome by

the evil spirit of dominion, to strengthen the enfeebled members of his body, the Church, and to re-animate those who are on the point of falling away, on account of cruel sufferings. Relying upon the divine power of Jesus Christ, the Orthodox Church is deeply convinced that out of his infinite mercy to the frailty of man, our Lord will work a miracle before all the world, by effecting a sound cure of the wounds with which the Church of Rome is afflicted, by giving life to her instead of death, union instead of dissension, one-sided discussions, reproaches and slanders; and finally, a perfect acquaintance with, and adoption of, the idea that the Holy Spirit had a personal existence from all eternity, from the Father.

"We cannot pass by in silence the circumstance that the Romans, when they bring arguments from the holy fathers, often confound the idea of the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit with the idea of His temporal mission, that is, with the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit which emanated from the Father, and were distributed through the Son. Two different ideas are expressed by the two Greek words, *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, which the ancient Latin fathers expressed by a single word—*substantia*. By this means the divines of the middle ages and of modern times confound two different ideas, and understand the substance (*ὑπόστασις*) where the essence is referred to (*οὐσία*) and understood essence (*οὐσία*), where the substance (*ὑπόστασις*) is in question. The Eastern Church believes and confesses that the Holy Spirit has the same essence (*οὐσία*) with the Father and the Son; but says that, personally and hypostatically, (*ὑποστατικῶς*) does not proceed from the Father and the Son, and rejects this innovation as an unfounded and blasphemous doctrine. Thus, the Westerns, by not clearly distinguishing between substance and essence (*ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία*), depart from theological truth. Here is their whole difference; this produces their schism and disagreement with the Eastern Church.

"May our God and Father—the eternal source of the peace of the world, and of unanimity among men—reconcile the two

Churches (provided that the Romans, after mature deliberation, will reject what they imprudently adopted in spite of the universal Church); and may these Churches which of old were sisters, but are now divided by dissensions, be re-united together by the Holy Spirit, proceeding, in accordance with its external existence, from the Father only! Amen. Amen."

There are abundant evidences in the preceding answers of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople to the overtures of Pius IX., with a view to the reunion of the Latin and Greek Churches, of unscrupulousness in dealing with ecclesiastical history, the writings of the fathers, and the records of councils. Still the document is valuable, as embodying the objections of the highest authorities of the Greek Church to union with the Latin one. Moreover, to me it has always seemed that too much light can never be thrown on subjects gravely affecting religious interests, and that the policy of shrouding those in darkness which seem to us objectionable, is generally only successful for a short time. I have no doubt, if I were able to lay before my readers a reply of the authorities of the Latin Church to the manifesto of the Greek Patriarch above cited, many of the most specious statements in it would be disposed of pretty much in the same way as St. Cyprian disposed of similar statements put forth by Greek ecclesiastics in his day:—

"These are the beginnings and original causes of mischievous schisms and heresies; first, a desire of the authors of them to please and elevate themselves; secondly, being puffed up with pride, to contemn their rulers and superiors. Thus they are led to abandon and forsake their Church, to erect a new altar outside of it, and against it, and finally they violate altogether peace and unity in Christ, and rebel against God's ordinance."*

* Cyp. Ep. 65, ad Rogation.

CHAPTER V.

The Armenian Community.

THE origin of this people is traced to the most remote antiquity. The regions to which is assigned the cradle of the human race, the Mount Ararat, of universal interest and veneration, including territory of some 420 geographical miles in breadth, by 900 in length, watered by four great rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, the Araxes, and the Phasis, comprising the Great and Little Armenia, are now, to a considerable extent included in the Russian dominions. Mount Ararat, rising from the region between the Euxine and the Caspian, the great place of veneration of the Armenians, now owns for its lord and master the Czar of Russia.

Armenia claims the derivation of its name from Aram, sixth successor of Haig, contemporary of Ninus. Strabo derives it from Armenus, one of the Aronauts.

The Armenians assert their origin from Haig, a great grandson of Japhet, who, according to their writers, fled from Babylon twenty-two centuries before Christ. The descendants of Haig they call Haighasdan.

Armenia, for many centuries, before it was overrun by the Persians, or invaded by Greek, Roman, Turk, or Russian, was a large independent kingdom, ruled over by its native princes.

Successive wars and conquests; changes of masters, and of

dynasties, vicissitudes of fortune of all kinds had reduced Armenia, in the 14th century to the lowest stage of ruin and degradation. A large admixture of creeds was a necessary result of so many races having been its possessors and inhabitants. Sabeanism, Magism, Zoroaster tenets, Greek and Roman Polytheism, Deism, Arianism, and Mohammedanism, all contributed their quota of dogmas and doctrine to the general stock of Christianity, degrading and debasing it to the condition in which it existed at the beginning of the 15th century.

There is one remarkable characteristic of the Armenians worthy of observation; wherever they are dispersed, like the Jews, they preserve a distinct national and religious existence, mingling with other races in commerce, but never incorporating with them, and always looking forward to their restoration as a nation, and their return to the old land from which they originally came.

The language of the Armenians in common use in their families, not only in Turkey, but in Egypt, is the Turkish. Their literary and religious language, however, is entirely different from the spoken one, and they claim for it an antiquity amply sufficient for its respectability—a date before the Deluge. The invention, however, of the alphabet in which it is written, is due to Mesrob.

There may be some Antiquarian honour and dignity in being (as Armenia had been) a tributary province of the greatest nations of antiquity, of Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Greece, and Rome.

About 260 A.D. Christianity first gained a footing in Armenia, but even in the lifetime of Our Saviour, some knowledge of Christ and his Gospel is said to have been brought into Armenia by St. Bartholomew the Apostle, and Thadeus, one of the seventy-two disciples. Syrian priests subsequently preached the Gospel in Armenia, and erected many monasteries on the ruins of Pagan temples.

The great Apostle of Armenia was St. Gregory, surnamed "the enlightener," who commenced his apostolic labours in that

country at the close of the third century, and converted the heathen king, Tiridates in the year of our Lord 302. He instituted the Patriarchal see, of which he was the first occupant, the title of which Patriarchate was Catophigos—the *Universal.* St. Gregory died in 342.

The introduction of Christianity into Armenia was followed by the dissemination of learning and science, and with surprising manifestations of intellectual activity for so limited a theatre for such exhibitions as that of Armenian life. Men of great mark and moment in literary and religious affairs started up, such as St. James of Nisiba, St. Isaac the Great, Mesrob, who invented the Armenian Alphabet, the historians, Phaustus and Khoren, the philosopher, David, &c. At the end of the 10th century, however, Armenia was torn by religious schisms, party strife, and rivalries, ready to fall into the hands of any enemy who was strong, and whose followers were united. The Saracen caliphs came into Armenia, saw, and conquered. Islamism accordingly over-ran the country. A portion of the Armenians fled northwards, settled between Kars and Ani, became an Armenian sovereignty, and subsisted for about a century under the name of the Kingdom of Ani, till it was ravaged and desolated by the Mongols.

Those who escaped with some of the Armenian Princes, styled Melik, or Kings, took refuge in strong castles, where they long retained, and in some of which they still retain the vain title of Melik. At the time of the dispersion by the Mongols, some of the Armenians fled into Cilicia, and founded a small state at Tarsus. There they existed at the time of the Crusades. They came to the support of the Christian cause, and "fought valiantly under the banners of the Princes of Antioch."

In the 14th century the poor Armenians and the King of Tarsus were threatened with destruction by the Mohammedans. In vain they appealed for succour to the Court of Rome, and to the Christian Princes of the Latin Church. The services of the

Schismatic Armenians, living under their own Patriarch, were forgotten, their appeal was disregarded.

The island of Cyprus, opposite the Silician coast, was at that period held by the Franks under a Prince of the House of Lusignan. An Armenian King at this juncture dying without heirs, the people offered their vacant throne to a Prince of the Lusignan House, and the offer was accepted. But the Turks made small account in Armenia of the House of Lusignan in Cyprus. An effort was made by the Knights of Rhodes on behalf of the Armenians, worthy of their valour and their order, but it failed, the Cross was thrown down from the steeples of the churches of Tarsus, and the Crescent was erected in its room. The standard of Mahomet of course finds favour in the sight of a deadly enemy of Christianity. Gibbon has nothing in catastrophes of this kind but triumph, of one order of fanaticism over that of another. The little Christian kingdom of Tarsus fell, and the last sovereign of the House of Lusignan, Leo the VI., after years of captivity in Jerusalem and Cario, died in Paris in 1303, and was buried in the church of the Celestins. A recumbent statue of the last of the Lusignans is still to be seen in the vaults of St. Denis.

If in all humility of spirit, and with due deference to public opinion, as it is expressed in the British Press, and reverence for the God whom Lord John Russell worships—Success—I might, in honour of the heroism and courage that has been unfortunate, pronounce a few words at the foot of this grave without offence, I would say—" Sta viator, heroem Calcas !"

A very small portion of the ancient territory of Armenia now remains subject to the Turkish dominion, and that small portion is ruled by Kurd chieftains under the normal sovereignty of the Porte.

From the time of the Turkish conquest of the Greek empire by Mahommed the II., the Armenians have had their Patriarch with all the rights and immunities of other patriarchs established at Constantinople.

In 1827 an impulse was given to the Nationalist tendencies of Armenian minds by the cession of a considerable portion of ancient Armenia to Russia by Persia and the conclusion of a treaty entered into and ratified the 22nd of February in that year, confirming that cession.

It has invariably happened that whenever Russia has gained any advantage in the East either by arms or diplomacy, whether in Turkey and its provinces, or in Persia and her provinces, such as was gained by the Russians, by their acquisition of the Crimea, by the cession to them of Georgia, on the part of the last native sovereign, George the XIII., in 1800, and by the cession to them of Armenian territory in 1827, the Christian Rayahs, most considerable of the communities, Greeks and Armenians of the Turkish empire have always been agitated and excited, and animated with hopes of deliverance from the Turkish yoke.

At the end of the last Russian campaign against Persia, when the latter had to cede two Armenian provinces to the Russians, the chief importance it is said attached to this cession by the latter, was the acquisition of the monastery of Ecmiazen, the seat of an Armenian Patriarch and the religious centre of all Armenia.

The Armenians in the Ottoman empire are estimated at 2,400,000, an approximate computation, and probably below the truth. Their numbers in European Turkey hardly exceed 400,000, of which about half reside in Constantinople. The great majority, amounting to about two millions, exist in Asia minor. The Armenian population throughout the whole world is estimated at four millions, of which their numbers in Russia are nine hundred thousand, in Persia six hundred thousand, in India and other realms of Asia forty thousand, in various European countries sixty thousand.

The aphorism of Homer—"The day that a man is deprived of his liberty half his worth is taken away," applies to the degraded conditions of all the Rayahs of the Turkish empire, but in an especial manner to the Armenians. They fell into servi-

tude from a a higher moral eminence than the Greeks. In their native country, in possession of it, and the enjoyment of the rights which God and nature gave them, they were a brave people, of a burly independent spirit, of a warlike disposition, but not in the sense of the predatory hordes around them. But during centuries of servitude, and that worst form of it under the stupid despotism of Turkish rule, all the manly instincts of their nature have been lost. The love of lucre, and the dread of rapacious tyranny have rendered them crafty and greedy of gain, timid, servile, and double dealing. Contact with Europeans has not improved them, the affectation of European manners and modes of thinking have tended to weaken the little that remained of national virtue, and to bring the national traditions to which they so long pertinaciously clung, into disrepute. In the changes that are impending it is difficult to imagine what their destiny may be. At the present time they are neither formidable to the Turks, nor very favourably disposed towards the Russians.

"The Armenians (says the Abbé Michou) have three independent Patriarchs, one of Etmiazin, one of Cis, and one of Aktamar, in Great Armenia. The Patriarch of Ecmiazin, in Russian Armenia, takes the title of *Catholico*, which means, universal head of the Armenians. The actual prelate is an intelligent prelate. The convent of Ecmiazin is one of the most important in all Armenia. There are found the best informed ecclesiastics. A priest of this convent studied at the school of Moscow.

"The bishops are nominated by the patriarchs, and are dependent upon them. Generally the bishoprics are sold to the highest bidder. Sometimes the diocese ask the Patriarch for a person whom they like. They obtain him; but always have to pay for the appointment. This is also done in the Greek Church.

"The revenues of the Armenian churches consist of the offerings of the faithful, lands, and other real property, the administration of which is intrusted to the synod. But at the bottom, the bishops manage them.

"To be an Armenian priest, it is sufficient to know how to read. Thus, the ignorance of the priests is so great, that many do not know the catechism. They marry before ordination. Their morals are generally blameless. They are unfortunate artisans, or ruined men, who receive the protection of some bishop, and receive ordination from him. The faithful support them. Their children are generally husbandmen. Amongst these priests, some are unmarried men; they are called *vartabet*, a word signifying doctors. They enjoy greater esteem than the rest, and out of them the bishops are chosen. These, in the Armenian, as well as the Greek Church, cannot marry. Sometimes bishops are taken out of the monks, but with a dispensation from the Patriarch, because the canons say that a monk cannot be a bishop. M. Tchamourdjan, to raise the Armenian Church, proposed to the patriarchal council to give the most important places to those ecclesiastics who had passed through a course of study. His advice was rejected, and the old routine is kept to.

"The Armenians, like the Greeks, go to church and say prayers early in the morning, and devote the rest of the day to work. Their liturgies go back to the time of St. Chrysostom.

"They have two synods, one spiritual, the other temporal. The patriarchal vicar is named Jacobo.

"The priests of the Latin ritual at Constantinople amount to forty regular and eight secular. The former comprise the French Lazarists, and different orders of the Franciscans; the others are the Græco-Latin priests of the island employed in the parishes. There are, further, two houses of the Brothers of Christian Schools, and two houses of the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul.

"Among the Latins there are a good many Armenians from Aleppo. The Armenian Catholic Patriarch was anxious to draw them into his nation, but they resolved to remain Latins. They preferred the general tolerance of the Latin Church, to the strictness of Christian discipline, still rigorously preserved among the Armenians. The Latin nation had, about twelve

years ago, a temporal chief, who was a priest. At present he is a layman. His name is M. G. Varthaliti. He is paid by the nation whom he represents, and for whom he acts. Each nation has its council, which is also called a deputation. The members of the council are elected every three or four years by the general assembly.

"The Greek Catholic ritual united with Rome, has at Constantinople only a little chapel, served by one priest and his deacon. The community consists of about fifty faithful, almost all Syrians.

"The Catholic Armenians are much more numerous at this time: intestine dissensions disturb their union. These dissensions were so great that the Patriarch was sent to Rome. The question on which the Armenians are divided is this:—one party, brought up by the Propaganda of Rome, are bent upon abolishing the Armenian ritual, and upon Latinising the nation by introducing the customs, ceremonies, and liturgy of Rome. The others wish to preserve their ritual and ancient liturgy. The learned and pious Mekatarists of Venice and Paris belong to the latter party. They are convinced that the way to delay, and to, perhaps, prevent the union of the Armenians still separated from Rome, is to manifest a tendency of robbing the nation of its national liturgy. They know that attachment to this liturgy has been a powerful means of preservation for the faith, and they fear the religious indifference which might follow the introduction of a ritual to which the Armenians are completely strangers, however worthy of respect as the ritual of the mother Church.

"There is no doubt that Rome does not understand the importance of preserving the rituals of the different nations who return to Catholicism, and does not blame the short-sighted zeal of men who believe they do her service by imposing upon other nations liturgies and customs foreign to their education and religious habits."*

* Narrative of a Journey in the East, 1850.

THE INFERIOR ARMENIAN CLERGY.

There are two classes, Derders, or ordinary Priests, or Vartabieds, or Doctors in Theology. The latter, the most learned, are enjoined celibacy, while the Derders may exercise their functions as priests in the married state.

The Armenian clergy spring from the people, generally from common workmen, humble artisans, and small tradesmen. Very little previous study is required to fit the candidate for orders in the rank of ordinary priests for ordination.

In every parish there is a lay administrator of the pious and charitable foundations belonging to the Church, called Mulevelle; when a priest is wanted for the church, the administrator is informed, and that person, who is generally a man of local rank and influence, exercises his patronage by choosing some humble follower or retainer, who has received some elementary education, can read and write, and recommends him to the suffrages of the faithful, and forthwith the election takes place, and the nomination of the recommended person follows as a matter of course, and that person, at the expiration of forty days noviciate and probation, all at once steps into ecclesiastical life, a ready-made *Armenian divine*, presumed to be perfect at all points in the sacred character and functions wherewith he was then invested at once and for evermore.

A preliminary form is, however, gone through; a petition is sent by the electors to the Patriarch, praying for the confirmation of the election made by them. The prayer of that petition is signed by all the clergy and parishioners, as well as by the Mulevelle, and that petition is always assented to.

The petition is accepted as a sufficient guarantee for the moral character of the candidate, but the formality must be gone through of a public examination, according to the ritual, as to qualifications, the candidate previously having re-

ceived minor orders, including the order of deacon. The formula of the ritual comprise answers to questions easily learned by a slight exercise of memory, and a night passed in prayer and hymns in the church. And on the following day the candidate for holy orders is consecrated. The obvious evils of this system of ordination has suggested improvements of late years in it, but the improvements have led to other evils. The test of moral conduct is now merged to a considerable extent in one of proficiency in the literary language of Armenia, and acquaintance with ecclesiastical works in that idiom. The candidate must now be a person of a higher rank, but his respectability is a matter of more consideration than that of faith or morals. It remains to combine both considerations, but in the meantime, great jealousies are excited between the educated and non-educated postulants, and the former appear, when sent forth as missionary priests, to have more influence over the masses of their community than the former.

If any one thinks it worth his while to know what my practical experience is of this mode of supplying the Armenian church with clergy, I am bound to say the result is favourable to religion, so far as the appointment is concerned of men who are perfectly sincere, strictly moral, and devoted to their duties.

The Armenian clergy receive no fixed support, and exact no prescribed contributions from their flocks like the Greek clergy. Their revenue depends mainly on the voluntary contributions of the faithful. A rich priest is a rara avis in ecclesia Armeniæ. They receive grants in aid of voluntary contributions from the fund of pious and charitable foundations in every district, designated Vacoub.

What we would call parishes are districts of churches, to each of which a certain number of families are assigned to the care of a sufficient number of ecclesiastics. The clergy of one district cannot interfere with those of another in the celebration of any religious services, or administration of Sacrament. The working clergy have no contributions to pay to the patriarch

or bishops, nor can they exact any from the people except for baptisms, marriages and funerals, the fees of which are regulated by a tariff publicly placed in every church. The principal voluntary contributions are those collected twice a year from the faithful, at the feast of the Epiphany and Easter. The ordinary collections for the maintenance of the church and its requirements are made on Sundays and festivals, and the octave from Easter to Whitsuntide.

THE ARMENIAN MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS.

Formerly monks and monasteries abounded in the Turkish empire. At the present time monasteries are becoming rare, and those which exist are generally in a ruinous condition. Consequently monks are become rare also, for it is a consequence I think in all countries with which I am acquainted, with one exception, that where edifices do not exist for ecclesiastical purposes, congregations for them diminish rapidly, and at length cease to exist at all. I speak of countries whose people, or large communities of them, have been persecuted on account of their religious tenets.

The mode of life of Armenian monks is hardly less austere than that of Greek inmates of monasteries; one meal a day, consisting of herbs, other vegetables, and pulse is their ordinary sustenance; their exceptional luxuries of oil, milk, and fish is for two days in the week—Saturdays and Sundays. Their noviciate is long and arduous, it is only at the expiration of eight years probation they are entitled to the habit of the order, and during forty days previously to their arriving at that dignity, they remain in solitude, silence, and seclusion, even from the light of day. Other literature besides that of their liturgies, ritual,

and works on dogmatic and ascetic theology, is neither cultivated nor encouraged in the monasteries, nor indeed permitted, except to superiors of long standing and well ascertained orthodoxy. There are exceptions, however, to this rule in a few ancient monasteries, formerly renowned for the cultivation of science or letters, and where the odour of those pursuits still hang about the dilapidated walls of their dreary houses. The Convent of St. James, at Jerusalem is the residence of the Armenian Bishop of that city, who has the honorary title of Patriarch, and possesses larger revenues derived from the Vacoufs and offerings from pilgrims than any other Armenian monastery in the Levant.

The monastery of St. John the Baptist, near Mouch, ranks next in these respects. Next in order of eminence and claims to veneration are the episcopal monasteries of Angora and Tokal, and that of *Armach*, near Nicomedia, the latter having a seminary for students destined for the priesthood. The archives of the latter might be worthy the attention of Irish Archæologists. There are many Armenian monasteries of minor importance in Asia Minor, the Abbots and officiating ecclesiastics, of which many are married and reside with their families in the convents, and look upon the revenues of them, it is said, so much as hereditary property, that when one of the Superiors dies, the government of the monastery passes to his son as an inheritance.

Constantinople and its precincts contain thirty Armenian churches, one to each district of defined limits, to which the cure of a certain number of souls is committed. The ecclesiastical districts both in the capital and its suburbs, and generally in the provinces in large towns and their vicinity, have free schools of primary instruction connected with them, in which the children of the district learn to read and write, are instructed in their catechism, and taught the elements of arithmetic. The schools in the capital, formerly ill-supported by their several ecclesiastical districts, are now tolerably well maintained from a general fund for educational purposes.

The poor thus obtain some knowledge that is useful to them, and sufficient for their simple lives.

The upper class, at least the opulent mercantile community, the successful money changers, money lenders, money brokers, bankers, jobbers in securities, speculators in Government securities, loan makers on mortgaged salaries to Pachas and Mudirs, advancers of bribes to functionaries of State, civil and judicial; the sarrafs which compose this Armenian aristocracy obtain their education in foreign countries, Germany, France, and Italy. Attempts have been made to establish Armenian colleges in Turkey, but they have been unsuccessful. The labours of Mechita, however, have not been in vain. They have given the upper classes a taste for letters, a desire for knowledge, and there are many Armenians of the present day not only literary, but learned men.

The education of the female sex of their community of this aristocracy is limited to primary instruction, the elements of arithmetic, geography, embroidery, the social science of feminine grace, propriety, conventionalism, in the "minor morals," of manners, carriage and deportment—in a word, genteel behaviour before the world. Music forms no part of their accomplishments.

I have lived on terms of familiar intercourse with many Armenian families of the first rank in their several communities, in former years, and I cannot say I remember ever seeing a book in an Armenian lady's hand, or hearing one spoken of, or seeing a piano or harp played by one of them.

They get on in society, however, marvellously well without those accomplishments, and are by no means unrefined, unwinning, or uncivilised. Their women of high rank are remarkably beautiful, graceful, and elegantly indolent, if I may be allowed the expression.

The class in which the want of education is felt, seen, and most lamentably obvious, is in the middle class of the Armenian community. That class, which in Ireland, perhaps no less

than that of which I am speaking, in the Turkish dominions, suffers from the want of any kind of knowledge commensurate with the necessity for it, and the requirements of the position in which they move, or to which they seek to ascend.

The Armenian middle class are deficient alike in moral and intellectual qualities of a high order. They are vain and selfish braggards and poltroons, insolent to inferiors, servile and sycophantic to superiors, sharp, acute, and astute in business matters, not very sensible of the value or importance of any distinction between truth and falsehood, and exceedingly proud of their race and religion, without having the slightest knowledge of the history of either.

As far as their means allow, and probably in many instances beyond them, they indulge in that peculiar passion which the money broker aristocracy of their community indulge in so largely—ostentation in the *interior* of their dwellings, while the exterior will denote nothing but decay, dilapidation, dirt and dinginess, penury and gloom.

It is astonishing what fine furniture, expensive carpets, gawdy pictures, costly pipes are to be found in the abodes of Armenians who are only clerks to saraffs, agents, and factors to merchants. Ostentation within doors is the ruling passion, indeed, of all classes of the Armenian community above the lower.

The women of the Armenian Catholic community have generally abandoned the use of the yashmah and the feredgé, the veil and the large flowing outer garment, formerly used by them in common with the Turkish women.

But in adopting French fashions, their manners and modes of thinking remain Armenian.

The Armenians have suffered much at various periods, from the intolerance as well as the rapacity of the Turks, even in the reign of the late reforming Sultan, Mahmoud.

The Ottoman Porte gave its faithful Christian allies a striking specimen of the power of Reform, and the progress of en-

lightenment and toleration in 1843, in the spectacle of an execution of a young Armenian, twenty-two years of age only, named Ovaghian, for the crime of returning to his own Christian faith, which he had professedly renounced, probably in some fit of rage and passion, the result of domestic strife. In his sane moments, reflecting with horror on what he had done, he determined to abandon Stamboul and the religion of Mohammed, proceeded to the island of Syra, abjured Islamism, and substitued the hat for the turban, and after some time returned, as he thought, incognito to Stamboul. But he was soon recognised, arrested, tried before a tribunal of those holy men and doctors of the law of Islam, convicted, and had his head chopped off by that "most tolerant of all governments," the Turkish Government.

It fell, however, to the lot of the British minister, who thinks most favourably of the tolerant spirit of Turkish rule, to cause the ambassador of his nation at the Porte, to remonstrate loudly and angrily against the execution of the Armenian for the exercise of religious right, and such was the angry nature of the communications between the British ambassador, Sir Stratford Canning, and the Porte on this subject, that a rupture between the two governments was imminent. The ambassador demanding an abrogation of the atrocious law, under which the Armenian Christian had been put to death, the Sultan and his ministers declaring most truly, that the law was based on a fundamental principle of their religion, that the Koran not only sanctioned the penalty of death for apostacy, but ordained it, and that neither the Sultan nor the Porte had any power to abrogate what the law of Islam had ordained. The energetic British minister insisted in vain that the law should be abrogated. He then precipitately quitted Constantinople, and with all his suite went on board a British vessel of war, sailed for the Dardanelles, giving the Porte three days to deliberate on the final demand, preferred at the moment of his departure.

The young Sultan and the Divan, terrified, and, indeed, it

may be added, bullied into a violation of a fundamental law of the Mohammedan religion, speedily despatched a messenger after the importunate ambassador, consenting to abrogate all that he and his government were called upon to do. Accordingly the laws and the religion of the Turkish Empire were violated at the bidding of a Christian Power, and from that time the independence and prestige of the nation, and the only vital power of the Turkish government, its uncontrolled fanaticism, were struck down; from that blow greater mischief has been done to Turkish power, than it has sustained at the hands of any other Christian Power.

The influence at the Porte of Sir Stratford Canning from that time, was apparently commensurate with his successful bullying diplomacy, but probably the tone of triumph, and extravagant eulogy, with which the ambassador's success on this occasion was spoken of in the British Press and Parliament, led to mistaken views of the superiority of British influence at the Porte over that of every other nation.

A sudden impetus was then given to Protestant missionary labours in the Levant. Three years later, having been pushed on with an amount of energy corresponding to the high degree of influence supposed to be possessed by the British minister at the Porte, the other Christian communities were spiritually warred on by the new missionaries, pretty much the same way that Roman Catholics in Ireland are at this day warred on for the salvation of their souls. Their tenets were assailed, their schools and the dwellings of their poor were fired into with tracts and Bibles, their children were made presents, their servants were taken into pay, their priests were reviled, and the missionary societies at home were made glad and thankful to the Lord for glowing accounts of success among the heathen, and thereby for large subscriptions at home, and ample funds for their apostolic operations in foreign parts.

THE COMMUNITY OF UNITED ARMENIANS CONNECTED WITH THE CHURCH OF ROME IN TURKEY.

The origin of the schism of the Armenian Church and its separation from that of Rome, dates from the 6th century. It began, like many other schisms, in a war of words, in selfish but not sordid feelings, in exorbitant pretensions and inordinate pride, and as it progressed and extended in point of locality, as well as in regards to tenets of controverted subjects of discussion, human passions became more deeply and deeply engaged in these contentions, and dissidences in matters of opinion and discipline, became schism, involving questions of doctrines taught by authority, and required by authority to be received. The Council of Chalcedon, the 4th œcumenical council, assembled during the Pontificate of Saint Leo, had condemned the Eutychian heresy, and defined and declared the received opinion of the Roman Catholic churches throughout the world of all previous times, namely, that the divine and human natures united in our Saviour, formed a single person only.

The partisans of Eutychius, and especially his disciple of Dioscarus in Asia, propagated a report that the Council of Chalcedon had admitted a duality of persons, and renewed the errors of Nestorius. The Armenians were then hostile to their Greek rulers, and were easily led to adopt any views which were hostile to theirs, either of a religious or a political kind. They allowed themselves to be convinced that the Latin Church had fallen into the errors of Eutychius, and in the year A.D. 596 the formal separation of the Armenian Church from that of Rome was effected and completed, and it has endured upwards of twelve centuries and a half, with an amount of bitter bad

feeling that would be almost incredible, considering the nature of the differences between the two Churches, were it not for the reflection that the more groundless are the misapprehensions of unacquainted neighbours, the more unfounded are the suspicions and jealousies of families, communities, and nations, on the same borders of each other, of those nearest to us in blood, in the bonds of faith, and in race as well as religion, the more vehement are such suspicions and jealousies, and the more violent are the quarrels engendered by them.

Poor humanity, it is asserted daily in our press, in our literary, and scientific, and philosophical, and religious journals, is advancing towards perfection in social science, making rapid progress in political economy, improving vastly and visibly everywhere, even in Turkey, and progressing in civilisation. In fact, we are taught to believe, in this age of ours, that people every day are becoming wiser, and worthier of happiness in this world and the next; become every day less subject to infirmities, prejudices, mistaken views of economical, industrial, and social interests.

Alas! my experience leads me to no such conclusions. I do not find in the course of my reading of history, nor in my travels either in the east or in the west, evidence of any such happy change. As for poor Armenian humanity, it wears the same garb, sees with the same eyes, thinks with the same organ, reasons with the same powers, feels with the same tendencies of passion to excite, exaggerate, mislead, and misrepresent, to make false mediums, false appearances, false facts, false inferences, and false consciences.

Poor humanity is not a whit better in the heart of that Armenian community of which I treat, in the year of grace 1860, than it was in the year of the great schism of its Church, A.D. 596.

And let me ask the great authorities, the men of master minds, and of a great fame in social science, in political economy, the religious movement, in legislative and judicial vocations in the British dominions, is humanity there more

divested of its infirmities, rendered less subject to passions, weaknesses, miseries of all kinds, domineered over by fewer prejudices than it is in other countries, or has been even three hundred years ago?

The truthful reply to that inquiry most assuredly would be, *no essential change has taken place in its constitution.*

Human passions and infirmities change their aspects, garb, and mode of expression, from time to time, and the mystery and ascendancy of each of them may alternate and modify for the time being the phases of national character, without altering its nature. Humanity at large is changed effectually for the better, only by the influences of religion, and truly civilized only by the influence of genuine Christian principles.

The chief points at variance between the Armenian and the Latin Church, are the following:—1st, The Armenian Church rejects the supremacy of the Church and See of Rome. 2nd, rejects the Council of Chalcedon. 3rd, denies that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father. 4th, rejects Purgatory. 5th, rejects indulgences. 6th, retains certain rites of Paganism, such as the sacrifice of some animals, which sacrifice is called "Madagh."

At various times, between the three Patriarchs of the Armenian Church—the chief, or universal, at Ecmiazin, the second in Cilicia, the third at Pitani, there have been serious feuds and ecclesiastical quarrels.

There have been ninety-two Patriarchs of the Armenian Church, successors to St. Gregory. Several of them have been men of great Christian virtues, of heroic benevolence, munificence, and resolution in the discharge of their spiritual functions, none more so than Nersis, Archbishop of Georgia, whose independence not suiting the Russian Government, he was summoned to St. Petersburg, and banished to Besarabia. In 1843, the united suffrages of all the Armenian churches in Russia, Persia, Turkey, and its provinces, called this venerable prelate to the Patriarchal See of Ecmiazin, in the vicinity of Arazof.

The Armenian schism would probably have died out of mere inanition, if such a vast amount of superfluous pains had not been taken at the commencement to extinguish it. The more it was anathematised, the more obstinate it became in error. There is reason to believe the Armenians imagined that the Latin Church had adopted the errors of Eutychius, and yet with no little inconsistency, they rejected the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, by which Eutychius was condemned, and also the epistle of Pope Leo, which has reference to the same subject. The Armenian Church has been from its origin in a state of vacillation, hesitating in its conclusions on many matters, and halting between the doctrines of the Greek and Latin Churches, but clinging pertinaciously to its old ritual, discipline, and fundamental doctrines.

The Roman Catholic Armenian community in the Turkish Empire is estimated at forty thousand souls, but in this estimate I am disposed to think that those in Egypt are not included, but their number does not largely affect the preceding estimate. In Constantinople the Armenian Catholics amount to seventeen thousand, those of Trebizond two thousand five hundred, those of Angora nine thousand, those of Erzeroun four thousand, those of Artwin fifteen hundred, and those of Broussa one thousand.

In 1622, Pope Gregory XV. founded the Propaganda, or Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, at Rome; and to this establishment Gregory's successor, Urban VIII., joined the Collegio della Propaganda, with the intention of furnishing missionaries to all parts of the globe. I do not believe that the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith has always exercised a wise discretion, or has always promoted the true interests of the Roman Catholic church, by the proceedings it has adopted, either in relation to the schismatic churches in the East, or to those churches which have come out of the schism and sought reconciliation with the Latin Church.

The proceedings of the Congregation at one period, and with one class of schismatics, or communities returning to

the Latin Church, have been too violent; and, at another time, and with another community approaching union with it, or arrived at the first stage of union, has been too arrogant, too unyielding in its requirements, too rigorous in the enforcement of its views, too meddlesome in affairs of mere discipline, and too regardless, not only of the prejudices, but of the rights and privileges of churches long separated from the Latin Church, especially with regard to the appointment of prelates and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. This mistake has been productive of infinite advantage to the Greek Orthodox Church, and of incalculable mischief to the true interests of the Roman Catholic Church in the East. The violent efforts made at the beginning of the eighteenth century to detach the Armenians from their schism, were of the kind above referred to.

A few years previously (1587), Pope Sextus V. had sent an ambassador to the Greek communities of Syria, consisting of the Armenians, Melkites, Jacobites and Chaldeans, with the view of effecting a reconciliation with the schismatic churches; but the effort was virtually a failure, although the Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia had been induced to sign a confession of the Catholic faith, according to the statutes of the Council of Florence.

About a century later an Armenian priest, named Mechitar, renewed the unsuccessful attempt, after he had been induced by the Fathers of the Jesuit Order at Aleppo to return to the Roman Catholic faith. He became an enthusiast, too, in his efforts to reclaim his schismatic brethren; founded a religious society or order, the main object of which was the union of churches, and commenced the mission which he assigned to himself at Constantinople, in 1700. From that time we find the Armenian Church at Constantinople a prey to dissension. All the old controversies, that had been dormant for centuries, were revived. The agents employed by the Propaganda carried things with a very high hand, attacking the liturgy and practises of the ancient Armenian Church with extreme violence;

while the Armenian Patriarch and his partizans secretly and actively intrigued against the agents of the Congregation and their abettors; denounced them to the Ottoman Porte, and represented them as conspirators against the Turkish state. This old polemical policy of maligning, discrediting, and bringing State power to work the destruction of religious opponents, was eminently successful on that occasion. The Patriarch obtained a firman from the Porte ordering the banishment of the missionaries from Rome, and forbidding any one to harbour them on pain of death, and prohibiting Armenian Catholics to frequent any churches but those in communion with the Armenian Patriarch.

The successor of the wily Patriarch above-mentioned, in 1702, carried on the war with Roman Catholics with increased fury. The College of the Jesuits at Erzeroum, which contained three hundred young Armenians, converted to the Roman Catholic faith, was closed by order of the government. The Fathers, forced to disperse, took refuge in adjacent countries, chiefly in Persia. There is a very singular comment on this persecution in the number of European renegades, chiefly Italian Roman Catholics, who about this time had embraced the faith of Mohammed, and Von Hammer makes mention of one who, to prove the truth of his conversion, in the presence of the Grand Vizier, had trampled on the host.

But the triumph of the persecuting Armenian Patriarch was of short duration. In 1703, the French Ambassador, M. de Feriol, came forward in defence of the Roman Catholics, and obtained an order from the Porte for the deposition and banishment of the persecuting Armenian Patriarch.

Soon after, the influence of the rich Armenians of Constantinople was brought to bear at the influence of the French Ambassador. The banished Patriarch, on his way to the island of Scio, the place of banishment assigned to him, was said to have been secretly carried off and conveyed to a foreign land—some said to Marseilles, others to Messina, and those who were determined to be circumstantial, averred he was

brought to the island of St. Marguerite, where he died "of martyrdom," but what particular disease or catastrophe is implied by that expression is not quite clear. Some imaginative people, in after time, adduced arguments in favour of the supposition that the abducted Armenian patriarch was the Man in the Iron Mask.

There is nothing so effective as a vague rumour that barely hints a crime, and insinuates a suspicion of guilt, for inculpating an obnoxious individual, or society. It never was proved that the Patriarch was abducted at all, that he had not effected his escape, that he had not been rescued and delivered from his doom by his co-religionists; but it was first whispered about, and afterwards openly avowed, there being good grounds for suspecting that the poor Patriarch had been made away with by the Jesuits.

This was an ingenious device of the orthodox faithful to ruin the Jesuits in the capital, and once more the Armenians had a partial and temporary triumph.

The Porte was again moved by the Armenians to side with them. God only knows how many purses were judiciously bestowed in bribing the principal black and white eunuchs of the seraglio, the ministers of state the grand functionaries, and the ministers of the seraglio of the Sultan. Certain it is the Jesuits were banished from Galata, their printing press in the palace of the French Ambassador was forbidden to be used, Roman Catholics were prohibited from proselytizing on pain of banishment, and, by a special hatti sheriffe, the arrest of all Armenians who had united themselves to the Roman Catholic religion was decreed. Vast numbers were seized. Seven of the captured Armenians apostatised to save their lives; three others (priests), who refused to follow the example of the seven apostates, were put to death, near the gate of Pamma Capou. So much for the tolerant spirit of the Turkish government!

The Armenian priest, Mechitar, in the meantime, pursued his plan for the union of the two Churches. But, although he

had embraced the Roman Catholic religion, he did not approve of the measures of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. He fled from its missionaries at Constantinople, and took refuge in the Morea, where he founded, at Modon, a monastery according to the rule of St. Benedict, subsequently approved by a bull of Pope Clement XI. Some years later, when the Morea was overrun by the Turks, he was obliged to fly, and seek an asylum in Venice. There, the fame of his piety and patriotism having preceded him, he obtained from the republic the grant of the little island of St. Lazarus, and an establishment which had served for an hospital for lepers in the middle ages. He founded a convent of Armenian monks, who were called Mechitarists, from the name of the founder, and by these monks and their successors Armenia was rendered famous throughout the East. The master idea that animated the mind of Mechitar, and his plan for the extinction of schism, and the unity of the churches, was the promotion of national and religious interests. It is said that he was more attached to Mount Ararat than to the Vatican, and that his zeal for the Roman Catholic religion was subordinate to his ardour for national emancipation. I doubt very much the truth of this supposition, but it is very probable that the disciples and followers of Mechitar, in the course of time, and the progress of a feud gradually increasing in rancour as the violence of its contending claims progressed, allowed their national feelings to get the mastery over their religious principles.

Mechitar died in 1749 in his convent at St. Lazarus. But the feud which he engendered is not buried with his bones, it still lives and rancours in the bosom of the Armenio-Catholic community at Constantinople at this day, and threatens its dissolution.

In 1759, the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople, strengthened with new influence at the Porte exercised his power in a fresh persecution of the Armenian Catholics. The sufferings endured by them were embodied in a petition presented the

same year to the Polish ambassador, praying for his interference in their behalf. In that document they attribute their persecution to their refusal to do many things the Patriarch would compel them to perform or assent to, namely :—

"1st. To falsify several passages of Scripture. 2nd. To condemn the council of Chalcedon. 3rd. To deny purgatory. 4th. To admit the dogma that God might die nine times in a day. 5th. To believe in the legality of usury. 6th. To celebrate the nativity of Christ on the 6th January. 7th. To offer a sacrifice of bulls with rites and ceremonies borrowed from the worship of Mithra."

The Roman Catholic Armenian community was at first spiritually governed by an archbishop of the Latin church, and civilly by a nazir who was a Mohammedan. This arrangement placed the community of Armenian Roman Catholics, in an inferior position to that of any other Christian community in the Turkish Empire. The ambassadors of Roman Catholic nations at the Porte, but chiefly the representative of the French court, renewed their interference on behalf of the Armenian Roman Catholic community, and they succeeded in getting rid of the Turkish Nazir, and combining the civil and spiritual authority of the community in a bishop, having the authority, but not bearing the title of a Patriarch. But this community was not satisfied; they would have a Patriarch of their own, and they got one by dint of persecution, for never in this world has a persecution on a grand scale been so successfully persecuted on a small one as the unfortunate Ottoman Porte has been in its decrepitude by remonstrances and complaints by all the conflicting communities of Christian rayahs throughout the Turkish empire, continually urged upon its attention by European ambassadors of Catholic and Protestant states, of heterodox and orthodox churches, each representing a government jealous of the other, and by all the means at its disposal, legitimate or base, *per fas aut nefas*, seeking to thwart and frustrate the policy of a rival power by

undermining the Christian influence of its representative at the Court of a Mahommedan sovereign.

The Armenian Roman Catholics from the period of the appointment of a patriarch became a separated community entirely distinct from the old anti-Roman Armenian one, having their own facilities for bringing their grievances to the footstool of the Padishaw.

The unfortunate Mahommedan dominion in Turkey in its decrepitude and decline, has had no peace for the last century, especially for any length of time, in the exercise of its peculiar notions of toleration: complaints, remonstrances, threats of Christian sovereigns through their ambassadors on account of outrages on Christian rayahs, seem never to cease persecuting that "most tolerant of all governments," as a British Minister is pleased to designate that of Turkey.

In 1821, in one of those panics of ordinary occurrence in Constantinople, in which great masses of the Mahommedan population, and considerable numbers of the functionaries of the State, from the highest to the lowest, become involved whenever an insurrection of rayahs breaks out in a distant province, or a war with Russia is apprehended, the Armenian community, and especially the members of it of the Roman Catholic church were menaced with destruction, but happily on that occasion terrified fanaticism was satisfied with the ruin and extermination only of the powerful Catholic family of Oglou.

A little later, another panic was followed by a new persecution of Christians.

In the Turkish capital a religious war had been proclaimed officially by the Sultan the 18th December, 1827. Nothing could exceed the exasperation of the whole Turkish population, and the same Sultan Mahmoud, who a little later was a reformer of abuses. A promulgator of edicts enjoining toleration was on this occasion actuated in all his acts by feelings at once sanguinary and fanatical in the extreme. He medi-

tated for some time the extermination of all the Christian rayahs in the capital, but fortunately was induced to abandon the atrocious project.

A fierce persecution of Christians, however, was carried on, and those who suffered most were the Armenian Roman Catholics, who were accused not only by the Turks, but their other equally deadly enemies of the two, so called, orthodox churches.

On the 8th of January, 1828, by a public edict, the principal Roman Catholic Armenian bankers and merchants were banished, and their houses and country houses and stores were taken possession of by Turkish soldiers.

All the Armenians of Angora residing in Constantinople were ordered to depart forthwith from the capital and had to fly, leaving all their effects and property behind them. By a new edict the whole of the Roman Catholic Armenian population were ordered at the expiration of fifteen days to depart from the city and take up their quarters in the neighbouring villages. Death was denounced as the penalty of harbouring a Roman Catholic Armenian. The Porte declared that it recognized only one Armenian religion in the Turkish empire, and one Armenian Patriarch of the orthodox church. All separatists were denounced as schismatics, and threatened with the direst penalties if they did not return to the true Patriarchal Church.

So much for the much-vaunted spirit of toleration of the Turkish Government.

In the beginning of 1828 a new panic seized on the Turkish population of Constantinople. The Sultan, the officers of State, soldiers, mufti, ulemas, imaums, dervishes, all were infected with an epidemic terror and raging frenzy of rabid fanaticism. The recently received news of the destruction of The Turkish and Egyptian fleets at Navarino, by the English, French, and Russians had caused this new explosion of rage and alarm, venting their fury in cries of vengeance on the Giaours, death to the rayahs, and wild denunciation against the

whole Christian community, who were waiting, it is supposed, the arrival of the hostile fleets from Navarino to massacre the Osmalis. The panic and its accompanying denunciations quickly spread far and wide, even to the most distant parts of Syria. News of the prevailing agitation reached Jerusalem while I was there, but timely notice of the dangers to which all Christians were exposed, enabled me to get clear by a precipitate journey overland to Sidon, where I was fortunate enough to find an English vessel about to sail for Egypt.*

When the panic and the persecution of 1827-1828 terminated, then came the customary phase of diplomatic interference at the Porte, of complaints, protests, remonstrances, and menaces, always following close on the heels of Turkish outrages on its Christian subjects. On this occasion they came from the French embassy at Constantinople. The Ambassador of the French Sovereign, the Count Guilleminot, proceeded with such energy, and asserted with such a high hand the right of his sovereign to assume the character of protector of the Roman Catholic Church and its members in the Ottoman Dominions, that all the severe measures of the government against the Roman Catholic Armenians were rescinded, and in 1829 measures of protection, privileges, and immunities which they never had before were demanded imperatively, and extorted at length from the reluctant Porte. A Patriarch of their community, to be appointed by the Vatican, was recognized as the head of the religion of the Roman Catholic Armenians in Turkey.

The Ambassador did not limit his demand for the protection, "the full and entire emancipation" of the Armenians in communion with the Church of Rome, he claimed the same for all other Christians of the Roman Catholic subjects, specifying particularly the Maronites, Melkites, and Chaldean-Syrians, demanding for the three Roman Catholic communities just

* Vitans Charybdim incidit in Scyllam. It was my fate on this occasion in flying from the Turks to fall into the hands of Greek pirates.

mentioned, the privilege of having separate religious chiefs, recognised by the Roman Catholic Church. The Porte at first insisted on guaranteeing the spiritual independence of those communities under the protection of a Mussulman civil chief, or Nazir; but the ambassador's renewed demands soon led to the Nazir being replaced by a bishop, and eventually by a Patriarch. Thus, in 1829, while the Roman Catholic Irish Rajahs of the British Empire were being emancipated, the Roman Catholic "dogs of Christians" in the Turkish Empire, were likewise walking out of their chains.

The Armenian community no sooner got their Patriarch an institution, than they found the greatest possible difficulty. The result of this embarrassment was a new persecution of the old enemy, the Turkish Porte, and a new arrangement—separation of the temporal and spiritual authorities, the former, or rather the administrative part of it, to be exercised by a Patriarch elected by the community, the latter by a Primate appointed by the Pope. It is hardly necessary to add, the two authorities were no sooner constituted than they clashed; each protested against the encroachments of the other, and affairs were becoming seriously embroiled, verging on a religious war, when the contest was happily ended by a compromise. A deliberative voice in the council was conceded to the Primate, and the Patriarchal attributes were divided into three parts, and confided respectively to the Patriarch, to the Primate, and the President of the council. Separate functions were likewise given to magistrates, at whose tribunals civil and criminal causes of minor importance, and common disputes *inter se* were tried; others of more importance were reserved for arbitration by another tribunal, and in a short time the reputation of these Roman Catholic tribunals became so great for fairness and justice, that the Rayahs of other communities, and even Mussulmans, in their differences with Catholics, voluntarily had recourse to them.

The Roman Catholic Armenian community included in its Protectorate the small Roman Catholic communities called

Aleppans, Melkites, Syrians, and Chaldeans, and certainly the protection afforded to them, and the influence exerted for them in common with all Roman Catholics included in the United Armenian community, by the French ambassador at Constantinople, left them no reasonable ground of complaint. The Aleppans, however, got tired of the protection of the community, and declared their determination, that rather than endure it, they would place themselves under the Greek or the Armenian Patriarch. They appealed to Rome, and also to Austria, who at this time began to take a tender interest in the welfare of Syrian Roman Catholics, who had hitherto owed their protection to French influence in those countries. The appeal to Austria, in all probability, had led to a decree of the Porte, in virtue of which, the Alleppans were separated from the Roman Catholic Armenian community, replaced in the class of Latin rajahssi, with a Turkish functionary at their head; this *privilege*, and also that of having an official seal of their own, as a distinct religious body, was demanded and obtained for them by Austria, that tender, loving mother of Roman Catholic Christianity in Syria when French influence was to be undermined by the new mission it had given itself, in the same way that it had been patronised and encumbered with its protection in Italy, whose liberty was to be assailed under the mask of its support.

The success of Austria on behalf of its Aleppan protegés was productive of great mischief to the Roman Catholic Armenian community. It led to intrigues, dissensions, jealousies, and exposure in short, of Roman Catholics throughout Syria, to renewed attacks, both open and secret, and of increased violence on the part of their enemies. In this state of things the Roman Catholic community suffered considerably, both in influence and number, and at the very period when wise and prudent measures, and large views, and a conciliatory spirit were particularly necessary in the government of its affairs, the course pursued towards this community by the congregation of the Propaganda in Rome, was by no means calculated to retrieve

its affairs by restoring peace, concord, and union. The old dissensions between the Mechitarists and Propagandists broke out afresh, and only five years ago threatened the extinction of the Roman Catholic Armenian community.

The Armenian Primatial Church of Constantinople is first made mention of in the year 1307. Many privileges were conferred on this Archbishopric by the Sultan Mohammed the II., and also on the Patriarch. The Archbishop used the title Patriarch as an honorary distinction, but never usurped the functions. The number of Armenian dioceses is thirty six, besides many monasteries, which are called bishoprics. The election of the bishops and of all the Armenian clergy is made by universal suffrage. When a church requires a bishop the clergy send a deputation or petition to the Patriarch at Constantinople with a list of the candidates thus elected, setting forth the merits of each. The Patriarch, assisted by its council, makes a choice. The newly elected bishop is then summoned to Constantinople, where he is examined rigorously, after which his competency for his functions being ascertained, his nomition takes place.

The ecclesiastical hierarchy of the United Armenian community (in connexion with the Church of Rome), consists of 1st, a Patriarch; 2nd, a Primate of Constantinople; 3rd, the Bishops; 4th, the Clergy, secular and monastic. The Patriarch styled of Cilicia, whose seat was formerly at Sis, in Cilicia, now resides in the Lebanon, at Bezaummar, he had two archbishops in partibus, and the Bishops of Aleppo Merdin and Amasia Tokat as suffrigans. In 1830 the primatial seat of Constantinople was made entirely independent of the Patriarch of Cilicia and of the Porte. All the expenses of the primatial see are provided for by the Propaganda of Rome, and the society for the propagation of the faith. The contribution of the latter towards the primatial see at Constantinople for some years past has averaged a thousand a year. The mode of electing the Roman Catholic Primate above referred to, whose primatial seat is at Constantinople, was for the Roman Ca-

tholic Armenian community to send the names of three candidates of different degrees of worthiness but all deemed fit for the vacant office, and one of the three recommended by the community was to be selected, and was invariably appointed, by it.

We now are in a position to form an opinion of the circumstances which have brought the Roman Catholic Armenian community into controversies, dissensions, and jealousies, that have menaced it with schism and extinction.

In 1845, on the death of the Primate Marusci, Monsignore Hassoun was appointed by the Vatican without reference of any sort to the patriarch, or primate, or prelates of the Roman Catholic Armenian community. There was no participation of the national church or community in this appointment. On the notification of this appointment being received by the community, displeasure, and even indignation were loudly expressed at this departure from an ancient usage, an innovation which they alleged violated the rights of their hierarchy, and gave serious uneasiness to the minds of the community at large.

"The Primate of Cilicia being at Rome (says Ubicini) took upon himself, without consulting the authorities of his own country, or even acquainting them with his intentions, to obtain from Pius IX., a pastoral letter, erecting the cities of Broussa, Angora, Trebizond, Erzeroum, and Artwin into bishoprics, and appointing five prelates chosen by himself and the See of Rome to fill them. The United Armenian community resented, not unnaturally, this ecclesiastical encroachment, and though consenting to recognize the institution of the five new bishoprics—notwithstanding the necessity for them was not very apparent—refused to confirm the nomination of the individuals selected to be the new bishops, on the ground of the irregularity of their appointment: while the Porte, which had kept aloof from the dispute concerning the election of the primate, now intervened, as its own prerogatives were virtually attacked. It must be remembered that provin-

cial bishops of the United Armenian church enjoy a civil power not possessed by their primate at Constantinople, and that the pretension of the Papal See would have enabled it to create an authority over a certain portion of the Sultan's subjects wholly foreign to and uncontrolled by the Porte itself."*

The Court of Rome replied to these remonstrances, justifying their own course on the grounds of its being calculated to secure the independence of the United Armenian church, refusing to accede to the wishes of the remonstrants, and asserting that the procedure complained of was based on a principle which could not be departed from.

The contested election was then brought before a council of the community, and a programme was laid down setting forth the various forms and formulas necessary to be adopted on all occasions of a necessity having arisen to elect a primate. One of the principal articles of this plan of election (the 25th) was based on an ancient regulation, requiring that the primate should be nominated from a list of three candidates chosen and recommended by the community, and in case of refusal of the court of Rome to elect one of these persons that a protest should be made against the nomination.

When this article came to be discussed, scenes of unparalleled violence in the United Armenian council ensued, those who were opposed to the violation of the ancient usage of their church were of dubious orthodoxy—Mechitarists—those who were in favour of the abolition of all national rights and privileges were Propagandists of indisputable orthodoxy. The community was torn to pieces in the strife of a controversy that ought never to have been caused.

What did it matter to Roman Catholic interests in the East or in the West that an Italian ecclesiastic was more or less lucratively provided for? But it did matter prodigiously to the interests of the Roman Catholic religion in the East that the ancient usages of a church in common with it should not be

* See "Lettres sur la Turquie."

ignored, infringed, abolished. The court of Rome, for the interests of the Catholic Church either in the East or in the West, should never have been composed exclusively of ecclesiastical dignitaries of one nation, nor of several Italian provinces ruled with a rod of iron by the Austrian empire.

I can very well understand at particular junctures or in emergencies of life or death, importance to the interests of religion, with a view to the prevention of the terrible evils of a schism or a heresy, that it might be prudent, nay absolutely imperative on the Court of Rome to supersede for that emergency an ancient right and privilege of a church, and to exercise its own superior authority even with a high hand, in nominating a primate or other prelate to a see solely and essentially with a view to its interests and for that occasion holding in abeyance an ancient and legitimate usage which provided for that nomination in a different manner. But if no such crisis or emergency existed, if the results of an innovation like that which I allude to were not calculated to promote the spiritual interests of the community affected by it, nor at all likely to be permanently advantageous to them, then the question of the expediency or prudence of that innovation must appear to historical inquiry extremely doubtful. The question brought to an issue by this contest of 1845 was fraught with evil to the Roman Catholic Armenian community; public attention was withdrawn from all secular concerns and bestowed entirely on polemics; the administration of its affairs was neglected; and a debt of small amount was increased to a million of piastres. Affairs remained in this state till 1851, when the Roman Catholic Primate of Cilicia being at Rome took upon himself, without consulting the ecclesiastical authorities, to obtain from the court of Rome the creation of the several new bishoprics, and the appointment of the five prelates to sees created in Broussa, Angora, Trebizond, Erzeroum, and Artwin. The contests and controversies thus excited, raged for a long time, but eventually the Roman Catholic community to avoid a schism recognized the nomination of the new bishop,

reserving to itself its national right of recommendation of candidates on the occurrence of the next vacancy.

I am not ignorant of some valid reasons which might be adduced under existing circumstances for the innovation I have just referred to, practised in the Roman Catholic Armenian community with respect to the ordination of priests, the selection of persons recommended for appointment to Bishoprics, and the difficulties connected with the marriage state of ecclesiastics of the Eastern churches, recognized though it be by the Holy See, not only at variance with its discipline, but productive of discord in several of the Eastern churches. But it is very doubtful to me if these reasons would be valid if other means had been adopted for improving the status of the Roman Catholic Armenian community, besides interfering with an old established national privilege of vast importance in the minds of all its followers.

If the See of Rome were to issue a rescript forbidding ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Armenian church to marry, the consequences in all probability would be fatal to that community, their resistance to it would be far greater than to any interference with the rights of ecclesiastics in relation to the nomination of Bishops. And yet although marriage is permitted to the priests of the United Armenian Church as in the case of other Eastern churches in communion with the Holy See, few avail themselves of the permission, and those who do are chiefly priests of the diocese of Erzeroum and Artwin, and their number is diminishing considerably. If any violent measures had been adopted to attain this result, they would not only have failed, but have made these marriages more frequent.

And now at the conclusion of this subject, a few words remain to be spoken plainly and truthfully, without regard to their bearing on any passing events, prevailing fashions of opinion, or any interests save those which are not "of an age but for all time." The opinions on most subjects of a person in his individual capacity of no eminence or influence on account

of exalted talents or position in society, are of little value or importance outside the little circle of his own immediate friends. But the opinions of an author who treats even incidentally of religious interests are so far of importance to his readers, that it is desirable for them to know what his religious principles are and the church of which he professes to be a member. Without that knowledge they will not well know what value to set either on his opinions or his statement of facts. With this conviction I venture, or rather I take courage to avow, that being a member of the Roman Catholic church, in all sincerity believing implicitly in its divine origin, mission, and destiny, that no vicissitudes of fortune, faithlessness of rulers, or fury of enemies can affect its stability, whether the seat of its spiritual empire be in Rome, Avignon, Vienna, Madrid, an Island of the Mediterranean, or in that Holy Land out of which it came, or any region of Christendom no matter how poor and circumscribed. The Court of Rome, as it has been for ages constituted, is not in my opinion essential to the spiritual life of the Catholic religion in the East, nor even advantageous to it. I cannot help thinking that the principal schisms in the church, some of which I have had to refer to in the preceding pages, although under any circumstances they might have occurred, would not have endured as they have done for centuries, if the Church of Rome alone, without the encumbrance of a Court, had to deal with them.

CHAPTER VI.

The Maronites.

THERE is great confusion about the founder of the Maronite community. There are no less than two or three saintly personages of antiquity made mention of in Syrian ecclesiastical history, of the name of Maro, or Maroun.

I find an account of one of these holy personages named Jean Maroun, in the "Essai de la Histoire Monastique de l'Orient," by the learned Benedictine of St. Maur. (Paris: 1680. pag. 338 and 348).

"Saint Maron established himself on the top of a mountain, which had been prophaned by the worship of idols, and, having consecrated to the living God, the temple he found there, he made use of it for the purpose of prayer. He built a cell near it, to which, however, he seldom retired; and in order to do penance, he generally lived in the open air. He founded several monasteries, and amongst the number, one in the territory of Cyr. He was equally a physician of body and of soul, having performed many miracles in restoring the sick to health, and converted numbers of persons by his holy instructions. He was greatly honoured by the faithful after his death. There was much dispute as to who should possess his relics, and those who carried them away, built over his tomb a large church, where, from that time they celebrated his festival. This church was probably the same as the monastery of St. Maron, of which we have already spoken." . . .

The two principal monasteries of Nicerte, in the second Syria are those of St. Maron and that of Jugat. It is very probable that the monastery of St. Maron was near the church where reposed the relics of this holy Abbot. For we know from Procopius that this church was in the diocese of Apamee, metropolitan church of the second Syria. It is certain that this monastery of St. Maron, held the second rank amongst all the monasteries of this province. The period which the above notice refers to is the early part of the fifth century.

The Maronite Saint, Maron, as described by M. Guys, in his work, "Beyrout et le Liban," and also by Ubicini, is a different person. He figures therein as the holy Patriarch, John Maro, or Maroun, who flourished towards the middle of the 7th century, and was made Bishop of Botrys, at the foot of the Lebanon. He rendered himself celebrated by his writings, against Nestorius, obtained the dignity of Patriarch of the Mountain, and fixed his residence at the monastery of Canobin, in the valley of Tripoli, founded by Theodosius the Great.

An historical document, a letter of St. James, the Syrian, the disciple of the holy Abbot Maron, ce Saint Abbé, as the learned Benedictine of St. Maur, styles him (Histoire Monastique del Orient, p. 348), addressed to the Emperor Leon, dated 458, is found appended to the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, which was convoked in 451, wherein he declares that the true faith is that which is laid down in the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (Hist. Mon. p. 568). This document is conclusive evidence of the decease of the Abbé, prior to 458, for the disciple, James, the Syrian, is said to have surpassed his master, Saint Maron, in the austerity of his penitential life.

No mention is made in the Histoire Monastique of any other Maron, saint, abbé, or Patriarch; therefore I presume this St. Maron of the fifth century, is the patron of the Maronites, and believe M. Ubicini, and several other writers who have treated of the Maronites, have made a mistake of three centuries in assigning him to the 8th.

The Maronites, from the time of the venerable Abbot or Pa-

triarch, Maro, or Maroun, were settled chiefly in the mountains of Tripoli, and many families likewise in the valley at the foot of the Lebanon, where the monastery of Canobin was founded by the Emperor Theodosius, and in the 7th century, in the midst even of all the ravages of the Saracens, preserved their independence, not only in religion, but their liberty and their mountain territory for a long time unmolested. Eventually they were harassed alike by Saracens and Turks, persecuted as *maradaites* (rebels against authority), and must have been exterminated, but for the intervention of the French Sovereign in 1659, who took *the Maronite Patriarch with all his prelates* under his protection, and instructed his ambassador at the Porte to remonstrate against the barbarous outrages that had been inflicted on them. This interposition saved the Maronite community; but considerable numbers of them, during, and subsequent to, the persecution they suffered, removed from their old settlements, and established themselves in other regions of the Lebanon.

Let us examine the claims or pretensions on which this intervention was grounded.

The Maronites from the time of the Crusades have claimed, and been accorded, a special protection at the hands of the sovereigns of France.

So early as the 13th century a sovereign of France claimed for the Maronites in Syria the same protection that French subjects enjoyed in their own country. In a letter addressed "To the Prince, the Patriarch, and Bishops of the Maronites," St. Louis said:—

"Nous sommes persuadés que cette nation, que nous trouvons établie sous le nom de Saint-Maroun est une partie de la nation Française, car son amitié pour les Français ressemble à l'amitié que les Français se portent entre eux. En conséquence, il est juste que vous et tous les Maronites jouissent de la même protection dont les Français jouissent près de nous, et que vous soyez admis dans les emplois comme ils le sont eux-mêmes.

" Quant à nous et à tous ceux qui nous succéderont sur le trône de France, nous vous promettons de vous donner, à vous et à votre peuple, protection comme aux Français eux-mèmes et de faire constamment ce qui sera nécessaire à votre bonheur."

But a century and a half previously the Maronites had fought in the ranks of the crusades of France under Godfrey de Bouillon, and when the Christians were established in Jerusalem and Godfrey de Bouillon was sovereign of the new Christian State, the French contracted closer ties of amity with their Maronite allies, than those in which they engaged against their common enemy, the Turks. Inter-marriages took place, and the children of French chevaliers and Maronite women born in Jerusalem and other strongholds and towns held by the Christians were considered as of French origin and entitled to the same rights and privileges.

The author of " Les Maronites et la France," adverting to to the early relations between the French and Maronites, says :—

" Des mariages avaient mêlé leur sang au nôtre, et ils avaient vécu sous la suzeraineté des rois Français de Jerusalem.

" Le malheur ajouta de nouveaux titres à ceux qu'ils possédaient déjà. Les infidéles, envahissant peu à peu les derniers lambeaux du royaume de Jérusalem, ne s'arrêtérent qu'au pied du Liban ; les derniers croisés Français vinrent s'y réfugier chez leurs frères les Maronites."

The claims of the Maronites and the concessions made to them in virtue of the patronage of the French sovereigns are embodied in the first capitulation which Francis the I. obtained for them from Sultan Solomon in 1553, which serves as the basis of all stipulations, political and commercial, not only on the part of France, but of the other great European powers with the Ottoman sovereigns. But in this particular treaty of 1553, Francis the I. caused a proviso to be inserted, of a then exceptional kind, which guaranteed to the Latin community of

the Convent of Jerusalem the possession of the Sanctuaries or "holy places" usually visited by pilgrims, which were then in their hands, and had been so (as the treaty set forth) "ab antiquo," without designating however these holy places.

"Les religieux francs qui, suivant l'ancienne coutume, sont établis dedans et dehors de la ville de Jérusalem, dans l'église du Saint-Sépulcre appelée *Kamama*, ne seront point inquiétés pour les lieux de visitation qu'ils habitent et qui sont entre leurs mains, lesquels resteront encore entre leurs mains comme par ci-devant, sans qu'ils puissent être inquiétés à cet égard, non plus que par des prétentions d'impositions; et, s'il leur survenait quelque procès qui ne pût être décidé sur les lieux, il sera renvoyé à ma Sublime Porte." *(Capitulations*, art. 33.)*

The demands urged by the French Government on the Ottoman Porte in 1851, in relation to the "Lieux Saints," were based upon an official Turkish document, or Berat, denominated by the French *diplome*, obtained by the Maronites in 1690 from the Porte and renewed at various intervals in 1695, 1703, 1731 and 1755, which has been made the basis of all the reclamations of France either on behalf of the Latin Christians in relation to the holy places, or of the Rayahs in Syria, professing the Roman Catholic religion. The text of this Berat is deserving of attention.†

* La Question D'Orient devant l'Europe Documents officielles, &c., sur la Question des Lieux Saints Annotes. Par M. A. Ubicini, auteur des Lettres sur la Turquie. Par. 1854.

† *Berat de* 1101 (1690 *de J. C.*).

"Des différends s'étant élevés à Jérusalem entre les religieux francs, porteurs du présent berat impérial, et les Grecs, au sujet de quelques lieux qu'ils regardent comme lieux de visitation, un sublime firman avait été rendu du temps de notre prédecesseur, ordonnant une enquête. L'on s'était, en conséquence, transporté sur les lieux, et des *houdjet* et des *arzimahzar* avaient été dressés, contenant les déclarations suivantes, faites en présence des deux parties: (les religieux francs possédaient) le droit d'orner le lieu qu'ils regardent comme le tombeau de Jésus-Christ,—que sur lui soit le salut!—situé au milieu de l'église du Saint-Sépulcre, et d'y tendre des tapis, les deux coupoles en plomb, grande et petit, qui recouvrent le tombeau, le droit de desservir le dedans et le dehors du tombeau, et la place au milieu de laquelle il se trouve; d'y dire la messe et d'y placer des flambeaux, d'orner de tentures le petit autel situé entre la place en face de la porte du tombeau et la grille de fer qui sert de limite à l'église grecque...; la moitié du cal-

Certain Greeks, as it was asserted by the Latins, about twelve years ago, had carried away, from the Grotto of the Nativity at Bethlehem, an offering of great value, of silver, adorned with precious stones, the star which had marked the place from time immemorial where it is alleged our Saviour was born, and of so much celebrity subsequently in diplomatic circles, as the subject and cause of that controversy which terminated in the late Russian war.

It must be borne in mind that in 1740, a new capitulation was obtained by the then French sovereign from the Sultan Mahmoud the first, repealing the ancient claims of the first treaty relative to the holy places, ratifying them anew, but still without designating the sanctuaries recognised as being in the possession of the Latins, and under the protection of the French sovereign. This omission gave rise to frequent feuds and contests between the Greeks and Latins of the Holy Land, which the Porte was continually called on to settle, and affected to do by ambiguous firmans, and contradictory decisions of the legal tribunal, the Mehkeme. The second treaty or capitulation between the French Republic and

vaire, qu'ils appellent le lieu de la crucifixion; le droit d'avoir le pas sur les autres nations dans les visitations; celui d'exercer leur culte dans le bas et le haut des sept arcades dites de Sainte-Marie, ainsi que sur la pierre de l'onction. Les Grecs s'opposent à l'exercice de ces droits par prépotence; ils ont enlevé les cierges des lieux où ils étaient.

"A Bethleem, la clef de la grande église, celles des portes de la grotte où êst né Jesus-Christ, dans la miême église, en tout trois clefs appartenant exclusivement aux Religieux francs. Nous avons vu et érifié toutes ces choses; un grand nombre de musulmans, incapables de rendre un faux témoignage, se sont présentés devant le tribunal de la loi, et ont déclaré que les lieux objet de la contestation ont été laissés depuis les temps anciens entre les mains des Religieux francs, mais que les Grecs les possêdent depuis quelques années, *par suite de leurs fausses declarations.*

"Vu le firman donné aux Religieux francs en 1045 (1635 de J. C.), sous le Sultan Mourad, en vertu et par la considération que le titre que leurs adversaires prétendaient tenir du chef des vrais croyans, Omar, fils de Khattab, *était dénué fondement, faux controuvé.*

"Vu les houdjet juridiques que les Religieux francs ont aujourd'hui entre les mains.

"Nous ordonnons que les susaits lieux, qui anciennement êtaient exclusivement affectés et attribues aux religieux francs, soient confirmés entre leurs mains de la même manière qu'ils y étaient.

the Porte, of June, 1803, confirms all former concessions or immunities to French Governors guaranteed by the Porte.

The contentions consequent between the Latins and Greeks of Palestine, on the vagueness of the treaties previously referred to, with respect to the particular sanctuaries, the custody of which was guaranteed to the Latins, continued down to 1847.

Of the various possessions of the Latins and privileges with regard to custody of sanctuaries in 1847, the Greeks had deprived them of all but six. This was the occasion of a note to the Divan from the French ambassador at Constantinople, in 1851.

It was not forgotten by the French Government of that day, in their instructions to the Ambassador, that Napoleon, under the walls of St. Jean D'Acre, had recognised the claims of the Maronites to French protection. "Je reconnais que les Maronites sont Français de temps immémorial."

The Ambassador was reminded that a treaty of commerce between France and the Ottoman Porte had been entered into in November, 1838. By the first article of that treaty, all the former privileges and immunities accorded by the Porte in virtue of former treaties, were guaranteed.

These lieux saints, or "holy places," are certain churches, sanctuaries, shrines, and sepulchres, in and around Jerusalem, either the sites or the structures of which have been renowned and venerated from the earliest ages of Christianity.

In the works of the old travellers in the East, from the latter part of the seventeenth century, we find many references to the Maronites, generally speaking, favourable to the character of this people, and many references also in the works of modern English travellers, of a similar kind. But of late it is to be regretted that our consuls and missionaries have taken it into their heads that the politics and polemics of their nation are to be promoted by disparaging the Roman Catholic Maronites, and setting up the half Pagan, half Mussulman Druses as their superiors in all respects, mental, moral, physical, and spiritual.

The Maronite Patriarch named by the bishops of his Church, and confirmed by the Pope, has under his jurisdiction seven suffragan sees, namely Saida, Beyrout, Damascus, Balbek, Tripoli, Aleppo, and Cyprus. The ordinary clergy is composed of twelve hundred priests, who serve nearly four hundred churches. The number of convents for monks is sixty-seven, and of those for nuns, fifteen.

The Patriarch of the Maronites formerly exercised very extensive powers not only of a religious but of a civil kind, for the protection of his people, who, in those times possessed many important immunities and franchises, which, since 1842, have been either abrogated or assimilated to the privileges enjoyed by other Roman Catholic subjects of the Porte. But the Maronites still, in all great emergencies and dangers, at the hands of their old and constant enemies, the Druses, are wont to look to their Patriarch rather than to the Emir, their nominal civil protector, for counsel and guidance. The Patriarch in the winter, resides ordinarily at Kesrouan, and in the summer at the monastery Canobin, in the valley of Tripoli, supposed to be, on very insufficient grounds, where the venerated Maro had fixed his abode.

The doctrines of the Maronite community are, of course, those of the Latin Church, but their ritual and liturgy differ in many respects from those of the latter. The mass is recited in the Syriac language, with the exception of the Epistle and Gospel, and some prayers, which are recited in Arabic, the only language understood by the people, the Syriac being used only in the services of the Church, and the offices of the priests. The secular clergy are allowed to marry by special permission of the Holy See, which indulgence is extended likewise to the clergy of other Eastern Churches united to Rome, with the exception of the Latin.

The Maronites now, or rather previously to the late massacres, did occupy the valley and fastnesses of the principal Lebanon ridge, East of Beyrout and Tripoli, extending inland to the Bekaa, the plain between the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon.

They numbered before the late massacres, about two hundred thousand souls.

The protegées of our British Consuls and missionaries, the Druses, were in all respects inferior to them in intelligence, industrious habits, morals, and personal appearance. I have rarely seen a finer looking peasantry, or known a more hospitable, frugal, honest, or more laborious people. The cultivated grounds of theirs—plantations of cotton and olives, fields of corn, and mulberry grounds, and vineyards—in some districts, especially in Kesrouan, exceeded in extent, and the evidence they bore to the industrious habits of the Maronites, all other cultivated grounds I have seen, either in Syria, or in any other portion of the Turkish Empire.

The numbers of the Maronite community dwelling in Lebanon and scattered over various parts of Syria are estimated by several writers at a higher amount than that set down by Ubicini, in fact, the estimates before the late massacres varied from 140,000 to 200,000.

The number of them actually slain in the late massacres, certainly amounted to 8,000.

The number of wounded who have since died, cannot be estimated at less than 2,000.

The number of members scattered during the massacres, or who fled from their homes to the adjacent islands, or to other provinces may be estimated at 20,000.

So that the population of Syria may be estimated at this date, as having been reduced, by the late massacres, and the consequences of them to the extent of 30,000, at the very lowest computation.

CHAPTER VII.

The Order of the Assassins of Persia and Syria, of the 11th and 12th centuries, and the derivation from them of the existing secret sects of Syria.

THE modern Druses, according to some authors, the Ansayrii, according to others, derive their origin from the Assassins of Syria of the olden time.

It is a curious circumstance that both Druses and Ansayrii, though now at least distinct sects, separated locally, socially, and polemically, so hostile to each other as to be occasionally engaged in deadly warfare (the Hon. Mr. Walpole had ample experience of that fact), in the fundamental tenets and principal rites of their religions, have many leading doctrines, and observances, and prejudices in common. Their creeds are a jumble of Mohammedanism of the Shiite sect of votaries of Ali, of Magianism, of Paganism, and a slight admixture of Nestorian and Pelagian Christianity. They both hold Ali in the highest veneration, their respect amounting almost to idolatry. Next in honour they have the great revealed Imaam, the Lord Hakeim. They profess to believe in the Metempsychosis. Some of them practise circumcision, not as an obligatory rite, but rather as an ancient custom, that has something holy and wholesome in it. They manifest alike the greatest possible anxiety to keep their religious tenets and rites secret. They both have degrees of initiation in their mysteries. They are bound by oath, or vows of the most solemn kind to keep

strangers from a knowledge of their religion. They both isolate themselves alike from Mussulmans and Christians, and abstain from the same kinds of food. They both carry hypocrisy to a greater pitch than the followers of any other religion. They loathe and detest Mohammedanism, yet in the company of influential Moslems they fast and pray like the disciples of Mohammed; and in Turkish towns where they are known, they frequent the mosques, and affect to be mussulman devotees. They both hold Christians in contempt and even hatred, yet to them they profess feelings of the highest respect, and sentiments of the most tolerant description for their religion. Nay, they profess to be half Christians, and some even go much farther. Yet in any persecution against the Christian Rayah of the Lebanon or Anti-Lebanon, on the part of fanatic Mohammedans, they side with the latter, and often secretly conspire with their representatives and agents, the Dervishes of the provinces, against their Christian neighbours, on religious pretexts, for the purposes of rapine and domination. They both certainly have a secret religion, if it can be so called, or an institution organised in a spirit of profound hypocrisy, a machinery of secret rites, secret prayers, secret oaths, or vows, for the accomplishment of their objects and interests of their several sects. Arrogant and specious pretexts to great zeal for religion, and strong tendencies to spoil and plunder those who are not of their faith. And in all these respects they both have striking analogies with the ancient secret sect or order of the Assassins.

In Europe there has been only one secret society, composed of fanatics and marauders animated by similar instincts, a fierce detestation of neighbouring people of a different religion, an irresistible desire to trample on them, to spoil and slay them in the name of religion—the secret institution of Irish Orangeism.

The reader who peruses the following outline of the ancient order of Assassins, and accounts of the Druses and the Ansayrii, and the religious tenets and observances of both, certainly the most complete of all authentic descriptions of them, will be able

to determine which of the two sects and tribes of the Ansayrii and Druses have the most *rapport* with the older secret order of the Assassins.

"After the time of Mohammed (says Sale), Arabia was, for about three centuries, under the caliphs, his successors, But in the year 325 of the Hegira, great part of that country was in the hands of the Karmatians, a new sect, who had committed great outrages and disorders even in Mecca, and to whom the caliphs were obliged to pay tribute, that the pilgrimage thither might be performed.

"The Karmatians, a sect which bore an inveterate malice against the Mohammedans, began first to raise disturbances in the year of the Hegira 278, and the latter end of the reign of Mohammed. Their origin is not well known, but the common tradition is, that a poor fellow whose name some call Karmala, came from Kuzistan, to the villages near Cufa, and there feigned great sanctity and strictness of life, and that God had enjoined him to pray fifty times a day, pretending also to invite people to the obedience of a certain Imàm, of the family of Mohammed.

[Having suffered persecution and imprisonment at the hands of the Governor of the Province, he contrived to effect his escape, his adherents giving out that God had taken him into Heaven.]

"Afterwards (continues Sale), he appeared in another province, and declared to a great number of people he had got about him, that it was not in the power of any to do him hurt, notwithstanding which, his courage failed him, he retired into Syria, and was not heard of any more. His sect, however, continued and increased, pretending that their master had manifested himself to be a true prophet, and had left them a new law, wherein he had changed the ceremonies and forms of prayer used by the moslems, and introduced a new kind of fast; and that he allowed them to drink wine, and dispensed with several things commanded in the Koran. They also turned the precepts of that book into allegory; teaching that prayer was

the symbol of their obedience to their Imam, and fasting that of silence, or concealing their dogmas from strangers. They also believed fornication to be the sin of infidelity; and the guilt thereof to be incurred by those who revealed the mysteries of their religion, or paid not a blind obedience to their chief. They are said to have produced a book, wherein was written (among other things), 'In the name of the most merciful God: Al Faraj Ebn Othman, of the town of Nesrana, saith, that Christ appeared unto him in a human form, and said, "Thou art the invitation; thou art the demonstration; thou art the camel; thou art the beast; thou art John, the son of Zacharias; thou art the Holy Ghost.' From the year above-mentioned the Karmatians, under several leaders, gave almost continual disturbance to the caliphs, and other Mohammedan subjects for several years; committing great disorders and outrages in Chaldea, Arabia, Syria, and Mesopotamia, and at length establishing a considerable principality, the power whereof was in its meridian in the reign of Abu Dhâher, famous for his taking of Mecca, the indignities by him offered to the temple there, but which declined soon after his time, and came to nothing.

"To the Karmatians the Ismaelians of Asia were very near of kin, if they were not a branch of them. For these, who were also called al Molâhedah, or the Impious, and by the writers of the holy wars, Assassins, agreed with the former in many respects; such as their inveterate malice against those of other religions, and especially the Mohammedan; their unlimited obedience to their prince, at whose command they were ready for assassinations, or any other bloody and dangerous enterprise, their pretended attachment to a certain Imâm of the house of Ali, &c. These Ismaelians, in the year 483, possessed themselve of al Jebâl, in the Persian Irâk, under the conduct of Hasan Sabah, and that prince and his descendants enjoyed the same for an hundred and seventy-one years, till the whole race of them was destroyed by Holagu, the Tartar."*

* Sale's Koran. Preliminary Discourse.

The History of the Assassins, by J. Von Hammer (translated from the German, by Dr. Wood. Lon. 1335), presents the only extant detailed authentic account of this singular confederacy, taken from Oriental sources, in any European language.

Von Hammer tells us the Assassins are but a branch of the Ismaelites, and these latter, not the Arabs generally as descendants of Ishmael, the son of Hagar, but a sect existing in the bosom of Islamism, and so called from Ismael, the son of Jafer.

A very short time after the death of Mohammed, his religion was split into seventy-two sects. Of these the two divisions of the Sonnites and Schiites, concern the history of the Assassins. Their main differences consisted in these matters of dissidence. The Sonnites (orthodox Moslems) recognised as legitimate the four first caliphs. The Schiites acknowledged only the legitimacy of Ali and his descendants. The former anathematise the murderers of the third caliph, Osman, the latter pour maledictions on the slayers of Ali and his sons. Generally speaking, what one execrates the other venerates, what one receives as divine in its origin, the other rejects as diabolical in its essence.

They received also the name of Mulhad (the Impious). The basis of their doctrine was on an idolatrous reverence for, and a deification of the first Imaams, notwithstanding that the latter rejected this doctrine, and contemned its supporters. Ali himself doomed some of the Ghullats to the flames to purge their doctrine of course and improve their theology. The Imaam Jafer excommunicated all who ascribed Godlike properties to the Imaams. The ghullat attributed all this opposition to their leading doctrine to modesty on the part of the Imaams. They went on teaching the same tenets, "gaining both teachers and disciples."

The great danger of their doctrine was, that it enticed an uncivilised people, always lovers of what is vague and mysterious in religious rites and dogmas, taught the ignorant multitude to be seditious, made them easily dupes of religious impostors,

instruments of their ambition, by turning the obedience of the people from a visible and imperfect prince, to an invisible and perfect Imaam.

The famous Shah Nadir endeavoured to effect a union between the hostile sects, but his efforts were as fruitless as those of the Roman Pontiffs to unite the Eastern and Western Churches.

The grand question which separates the two main divisions of sects, is that of succession in the Imaamat office of high priest and ruler, or right to the supreme pontificate in the family of Ali, claimed for his descendants.

The great sect of the Schiites, called Seidyee, hold that the office of Imaam descends from Ali to his sons, Hassan and Hossein, whereas other sects believe that Seid's brother, Mohammed Bekr, was the legitimate Imaam.

Another sect of the Schiites, the Hassan-ye, contend that the Imaam remained in the person of Mohammed, and never was transferred to any other person, he (Mohammed) never having died, but only disappeared for a time, and again appeared at various intervals under other names.

Another sect of the Schiites, the Ghullat (the extravagant), propound wild opinions, in which traces of the metaphysics of the Gnostics, and the mysteries of Indian forms of religion were to be found. Some recognised but one Imaam alone, others, a succession of them, and attribute divine qualities to Ali. They believed in the doctrine of metempsychosis; some of them that the Imaams alone are privileged to enjoy this successive transposition and transformation. Some hold that the succession of the Imaams was interrupted by Mohammed Bekr, the brother of Seid, believed to be still alive, a wanderer over the earth, concealed, like Khiser, the guardian of the spring of life. Others hold that Ali alone exists but in the clouds, enthroned there for all time, whose voice is heard in the thunder, whilst his wrath, and the brandishing of his scourge, are seen in the lightnings and in tempests.

All the other sects of the Schiites think the Ghullats are

"damnable heretics." The Sonnites say the same of the Schiites in general, and the Ghullats in particular.

The differences between the true believers respecting the "Revealed Imaams," some closing the succession of them with the seventh, others with the twelfth Imaam, some holding that several *princely* qualities were essential to a legitimate Imaam, others that mere devotion and innocence were required, favoured the insidious views of the Ghullat which from the beginning of their career seems to have been to obtain power and influence, utterly regardless of the means by which this, their main object was attained.

The sacerdotal faction of the Imaamie believed in twelve Imaams, the last of whom, Mohammed Ben Hassen Askeri, disappeared in a grotto in Hella where he remains, but will re-appear at the end of the world, under the name of Mohdi. The other sacred faction of the same order called Sebün, only reckoned seven revealed Imaams namely—Ali (cousin of the prophet), his two sons Hassan and Hossein, Ali Seinolabidin, Mohammed Bekr, Jafer Sadik, Ismail, and seventh and last, the son of the preceding Ismail. Ismailites made their doctrine of seven Imaams, and succession from the seventh prevail, and their power originated with the first dynasty of the Fahmites in the interior of Africa, and on its coast, at Mahmadia and Cairo and one hundred and fifty years later, the mountainous regions of Irak in Persia, in Asia Minor, in and on the coasts of Syria.

The founder of the Asiatic Ismailites was Obeidallah, claiming to be fourth in descent from the seventh or last revealed Imaam. These rights of the family of Ismail were long and fiercely contested by the family and faction of the Abbassides, (friends and followers of Abbas) whose interest it was to dispute and disprove the validity of their rival genealogical claims and pretensions. A solemn but secret inquiry was instituted in the reign of the Caliph Kaderhilla into the claims of the Fahmite Ismailites to the throne of the Caliphate of Bagdad, and they were declared false and unfounded. Fifty

years later, for a year the two royal prerogatives of Islamism, namely—of coining money and of ordering public prayer were transferred from Egypt to Bagdad.

In fact, Islamism at this period was torn to pieces by the seventy-two sects that issued from its bosom in the very cradle of its infancy.

After the destruction of the Persian Empire by the Arabians, the disciples of Zoroaster looked on Islamism with contempt and disdain as well as hatred, and sought its ruin by corrupting its doctrine and sowing dissensions amongst its doctors and Imaams. While affecting to believe in the religion of their late conquerors and professing to receive the law of Islam, they managed to introduce secret doctrines and mysteries, polemical controversies, and principles of libertinism, which brought the religion of Mohammed into extreme jeopardy. Those whose opinions bore the stamp of libertinism and irreligion were called Sindik (Libertines). Their first appearance in Islamism was in the beginning of the Caliphate of the family of Abas, the first of whom endeavoured to exterminate them with the sword, especially in the eastern provinces of the Persian Empire. In the reign of the Caliph Mansur, A.D. 758, a sect of the Rawendi, holding the doctrine of the transmigration of souls revolted, and in A.D. 778, Abdul Kahir also revolted, and in the same year the disciples of the pseudo prophet of Mokanna, "the concealed," who shrouded from his followers the excessive glory of his human face divine with a golden mask, made a religious insurrection. Mokanna held the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, that God had assumed a human form, had commanded the angels to adore the first man, and since that period the divine nature had passed from prophet to prophet, to Abon Moslem the founder of the Abissides, and finally had descended to himself. Mokanna was the first to introduce into Islamism the doctrine of transmigration of souls. He afterwards added the Indian dogma of the incarnation of the human and divine nature as well as the metempsychosis adopted by the Ghullats.

The revolution which transferred the power of the Abbasides to the Fatimites, was a benefit rather than an injury to the Holy Land. "The third of these Fatimite Caliphs (we are told by Gibbon) was the famous Hakem, a frantic youth who was delivered by his impiety and despotism from the fear either of God or man, and whose reign was a wild mixture of vice and folly. Regardless of the ancient customs of Egypt, he imposed on the women an absolute confinement; the restraint excited the clamours of both sexes. Their clamours provoked his fury. A part of old Cairo was delivered to the flames, and the guards and citizens were engaged many days in a bloody conflict." At first the Caliph declared himself a zealous Mussulman, the founder or benefactor of moschs and colleges; twelve hundred and ninety copies of the Koran were transcribed at his expense in letters of gold, and his edict extirpated the vineyards of the Upper Egypt. But his vanity was soon flattered by the hope of introducing a new religion; he aspired above the fame of a prophet, and styled himself the visible image of the most high God, who after nine apparitions on earth, was at length manifest in his royal person. At the name of Hakem, the lord of the living and the dead, every knee was bent in religious adoration; his mysteries were performed on a mountain near Cairo; sixteen thousand converts signed his profession of faith; and at the present hour, a free and warlike people, the Druses of Mount Libanus, are persuaded of the life and divinity of a madman and a tyrant. In his divine character, Hakem hated the Jews and Christians, as the servants of his rivals; while some remains of prejudice or prudence still pleaded in favour of the law of Mahomet. Both in Egypt and Palestine his cruel and wanton persecution made some martyrs and many apostates; the common rights and special privileges of the sectaries were equally disregarded; and a general interdict was laid on the devotion of strangers and natives. The temple of the Christian world, the church of the resurrection, was demolished to its foundations; the luminous prodigy of Easter was interrupted, and much profane labour was exhausted to destroy the cave in

the rock which properly constitutes the holy sepulchre. At the report of this sacrilege, the nations of Europe were astonished and afflicted; but instead of arming in defence of the Holy Land, they contented themselves with burning or banishing the Jews as the secret advisers of the impious barbarians. *

The Arabic name of the Ishmaelian sectaries who were established in a mountainous district of Persia in 1090, A.D. was Haschisins, which in its Anglified form, assassins, is derived from the word Hascihsh, an intoxicating substance, used in a beverage, consisting chiefly of the pistils of the hemp plant. Their sacerdotal chiefs, it is said, used this beverage to procure trances, in which they pretended to receive divine communications. In Syria they established themselves in Anti-Lebanon, their principal stronghold was at Maysut or Maysiat, in the vicinity of Damascus. These fanatics formed a secret society, partly military, partly religious, and were particularly distinguished for their murderous atrocities in the 13th century. They were nearly exterminated in the following century.

In the year A.D. 1011, of the hegira, 411, of the innumerable Mahomedan sects that sprung up in Persia, Arabia, and Egypt, the predominant one was the Seveners or Ismailites.

In maintaining their sovereignty, the Seveners, or Ismailites, were more fortunate than the other sects. Their power first originated with the dynasty of the Fatamites, in Egypt on the coast and in the interior of Africa, and, one hundred and fifty years afterwards, in Asia, by the dominion of the Assassins, in the mountainous parts of Irak, and the coasts of Syria. By the oriental historians, the African Ismailites are termed the western, the Asiatic, the eastern Ismailites.

During the reign of the Khalif Kadirbillah, a secret assemblage of doctors of the laws was held, in which the most celebrated among them, declared the genuineness of the Fatimites' genealogy, and their claims to the throne, to be false and void. Out of the secret assemblages of the Seveners

* Gibbons Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Edition 12mo. p. 391.

or Ismailites in Cairo, and their grand lodge of renovators and reformers of the Mohammedan religion, forty five years later, about 1057, A.D. came the secret order of Assassins, first in Egypt and Persia, and in 1090 in Syria.

The fellows and the masters of the Cairo lodge, inundated the whole of Asia; and one of the latter, Hassen-ben-Sabah Homairi, was the founder of a new branch of the sect, namely, the eastern Ismailites, or Assassins, before whose cradle we now stand.

Hassan Sabah, or Hassen-ben-Sabah, that is, one of the descendants of Sabah, was the son of Ali, a strict Shiite of Rei. He lived in obscurity, and unknown, during the ten years' reign of Alp-arslan. Immediately, however, after the accession of Melekshah, the son of Sabah also appeared at the court of the Sultan of the Seljukides, and with harsh words from the Koran, directed against promise breakers, reminded the vizier of the fulfilment of certain obligations of his youth. The vizier, Nisamolmulk received him with honour, procured him considerable titles and revenues, and introduced him to the sultan, of whom Hassan, by crafty hypocrisy, soon became master. The sultan consulted him on all important occasions, and acted according to his decision.

The lodge of Cairo, whose political aim was, to overthrow the khalifat of the family of Abbas, in favour of the Fatimites, spread its secret doctrine, by its Dais, (*i.e.* political and religious missionaries). To these were subordinate the ordinary partisans, Refik, or fellows, who, initiated into one or several grades of the mysteries, were, nevertheless, neither to teach them nor to collect the suffrages for any dynasty; this being the peculiar privilege of the Dais, whose chief, the Dail-doat, or grand-master, resided at Cairo, in the House of Sciences. This institution remained unchanged, from its foundation by Hakem, in 1004 A.D., to the time of the Khalif, Emr-Biahkam-illah, when the Emir-oljuyush, or commander-in-chief of the army Efdhal, on the occasion of an insurrection fomented by the members of the lodge, caused it to be shut up, and, as it

appears, to be destroyed in 1312, A.D. When, after his death in the following year, the society strongly urged their re-opening, the vizier, Maimum, refused to open the academy on the same spot, but permitted them to erect, in a different situation, another building, dedicated to the same purpose, which was Darolilm-jedide (*i.e.* the New House of Sciences); where public courses of instruction and secret meetings, as before, continued, till the downfall of the Fatimite dynasty. The effects of their doctrine soon appeared in the increasing power of the Fatimites, and the feebleness into which the khalifat of the family of Abbas gradually sank. Hassan had been in Persia, already initiated into the Ismailite mysteries of Atheism and immorality, and had even been deemed worthy to become a teacher and promulgator of them. The fame of his great talents, and the authority which he had enjoyed at the court of Melekshah, preceded him; and the khalif Mostansur, delighted with the acquisition of such a partisan, received him with honour. The chief of the missionaries or grand-master of the lodge, Dail Doat, the Sherif Tahre Kaswimi, and some other persons of rank and influence, were despatched to the frontiers to meet him; Mostanssur assigned him a residence in the city, and welcomed him in the person of his ministers and court dignitaries, and loaded him with marks of honour and favour. According to some, Hassan remained eighteen months at Cairo, sufficiently long by meddling in affairs of state to excite a vast deal of envy, jealousy, and hatred. At length he found it necessary to take to flight, embarked for an African port on the northern coast, encountered a frightful tempest, and it is said while the storm was raging, manifested the utmost calmness and unconcern. It would appear, during that terrible storm, while the thunder was crashing over his head, and the lightning flashing in his eyes, that his thoughts were taken up with projects of revenge; amidst the fury of the tempest he was planning the foundation of that secret institution for the removal of his enemies,

taking off great personages, upsetting thrones, and wrecking dynasties.

A wind, contrary to the destination of the ship, but favourable to Hassan, drove them on the coasts of Syria instead of towards Africa; Hassan disembarked and proceeded to Aleppo, where he remained some time; thence he visited Bagdad, Khusistan, Ispahan, Yezd, and Kerman, everywhere publishing his doctrine: from Kerman he returned to Ispahan, where he resided four months, and then made a second excursion into Khusistan; after staying three months in this province, he fixed himself for as many years in Damaghan, and the surrounding country; he here made a great number of proselytes, and sent to Alamut as well as other fortresses of the place, agents of great powers of eloquence. After preparing everything here for the future maturity of his plans, he went to Jorjan, whence he directed his journey towards the castle of Alamut, which became the cradle of his power and greatness. He had already, some time before, sent to this stronghold one of his most zealous and skilful agents, Hoesein Kaini, to invite the inhabitants to swear fealty to the Khalif Mostansur. The greater number had already taken the accustomed oath to him. Ali Mehdi, the commandant, who held the fortress in the name of Melekshah, with a few others, remained faithful to his duty, acknowledging no other spiritual supremacy than that of the khalif of Bagdad, of the family of Abbas; and submitting to no other temporal prince than the sultan Melekshah, of the family of Seljuk.

Alamut (*i.e.* the vulture's nest) so called from its impregnability, is the largest and strongest of fifty castles scattered over the district of Rudbar, in the Province of Karwin in a mountainous district on the confines of Dilem and Irak.

Initiated into the highest grade of the lodge of Cairo, he clearly penetrated their plan of boundless ambition, whose object was nothing less than the destruction of the khalifat of the Abassides, and the raising new thrones on their ruins.

He, who had until now acted as Dai or religious nuncio and political envoy, in the name of the Fatimite khalif, Mostanssur, formed the resolution of founding an order of secret organization for his own objects; Hassan's experience taught him, by the slender results which the Ismailite mission had exhibited in Asia, how useless it was to attempt to propagate the secret doctrine of the lodge of Cairo, as long as its superiors had heads, but not hands at their disposal.

He set about gaining disciples, ostensibly for the promotion of religion, but in reality for the accomplishment of his ambitious and selfish projects, assuming an air of extraordinary sanctity and asceticism, and doing all things in the name of the caliph of Cairo.

He obtained possession of Alamut partly by stratagem, partly by force.

Hassan provided his new stronghold with ramparts and wells; he caused a canal to be dug, bringing the water from a considerable distance to the foot of the castle; he made plantations of fruit trees around the neighbourhood, and encouraged the inhabitants in the pursuit of agriculture. While he was thus employed in the fortification and defence of his castle, which commanded the whole district of Rudbar, promoting cultivation and raising supplies, his care and attention were still more deeply engaged with the establishment of his own religious and political system, namely, the peculiar policy of the Assassins.

The civil war between the brothers, Barkyarok and Mohammed, concerning the territories of Irak and Khorassan, facilitated the execution of Hassan's ambitious designs; and in the bloody hotbed of intestine discord, the poisonous plant of murder and sedition flourished. By degrees, his partisans made themselves masters of the strongest castles of Irak, and even of that of Ispahan, called Shah durye (the king's pearl), built by Melekshah.

Besides the king's pearl, they took also the castles of Derkul and Khalnenjan, near Ispahan, the castle of Wastamkuh, near

Abhar; those of Tambur and Khalowkhan, between Fars and Kuhistan, those of Damaghan, Firuskuh, and Kirdkuh, in the province of Komis; and lastly, Kuhistan, those of Tabas, Kain, Toon, and several others in the district of Muminabad.

Hitherto the Ismailites had only masters and fellows; namely, the Dais or emissaries, who being initiated into all the grades of the secret doctrine, enlisted proselytes; and the Refik, who, gradually intrusted with its principles, formed the great majority. It was manifest to the practical and enterprising spirit of Hassan, that in order to execute great undertakings with security and energy, a third class would also be requisite, who, never being admitted to the mystery of atheism and immorality, which snap the bonds of all subordination, were but blind and fanatical tools in the hands of their superiors; that a well organised political body needs not merely heads but also arms, and that the master required not only intelligent and skilful associates, but also faithful and active agents: these agents were called Fedavie (*i.e.* the self-offering or devoted), the name itself declares their destination. How they afterwards, in Syria, obtained that of the Hashishin or Assassins, we shall explain hereafter when we speak of the means employed to animate them to blind obedience and fanatical self-devotion. Being clothed in white, like the followers of Mokanna, three hundred years before, in Transoxana, and, still earlier, the Christian Neophytes, and, in our own days, the pages of the sultan, they were termed Mobeyese, the white, or likewise, Mohammere the red, because they wore, with their white costume, red turbans, boots or girdles, as formerly did the warriors of the princes of Lebanon, and at Constantanople the Janissaries and Bostangis as a body guard of the seraglio. Habited in the hues of innocence and blood, and of pure devotion and murder, armed with daggers (cultelliferi) which were constantly snatched forth at the service of the grand-master, they formed his guard, the executioners of his deadly orders, the sanguinary tools of the ambition and revenge of this order of Assassins.

The grand master was called Sidna (Sidney) our lord, and commonly Sheikh al Jebal, the Sheikh, the old man or supreme master of the mountain; because the order always possessed themselves of the castles in the mountainous regions, both in Irak, Kuhistan, and Syria, and the ancient of the mountains, resided in the mountain fort of Alamut, robed in white, like the Ancient of days in Daniel. He was neither king nor prince in the usual sense of the word, and never assumed the title either of Sultan, Melek, or Emir, but merely that of Sheikh, which to this day the heads of the Arab tribes and the superiors of the religious order of the sofis and dervishes bear. His authority could be no kingdom or principality, but that of a brotherhood or order; the Dai, or religious nuncios, and political emissaries in ordinary, as initiated masters. The fellows (Refik) were those who were advancing to the mastership, through the several grades of initiation into the secret doctrine. The guards of the order, the warriors, were the devoted murderers (Fedavie), and the Lassik (aspirants) seem to have been the novices or lay brethren. Besides this seven-fold gradation from Sheikh (grand-master), Dailkebir (grand-prior), Dai (master), Refik (fellows), Fedavie (agents), Lassik (lay brothers), down to the profane or the people, there was also another seven-fold gradation of the spiritual hierarchy, who applied themselves exclusively to the before-mentioned doctrine of the Ismailis concerning the seven speaking and seven mute Imams, and belonged more properly to the theoretical frame-work of the schism, than to the destruction of political powers. According to this arrangement, there live, in every generation, seven persons distinguished from each other by their different grades of rank: 1st. The divinely appointed Imam; 2nd. "The witness" Hudshet, designated by him, whom the Ismailis called Esas, (the seat); 3rd. The Sumassa, who received instruction from the Hudshet, as they did from the Imam; 4th. The Missionaries (Dai); 5th. Mesuni, (the Freed) who were admitted to the solemn promise or oath (Ahd); 6th. Mukellebi, the dog-like, who sought out subjects fit for conversion for the missionaries,

as hounds run down the game for the huntsman; 7th. Mumini, the believers, the people. On comparing these two divisions, we perceive that, according to the first, the invisible Imam, in whose name the sheikh claimed the obedience of the people, and in the second, the guard, of which he made use against the foes of the order, are wanting; but that, in other respects, the different grades coincide. "The witness" was the grand-master; the Sumassa, the grand-prior; the fellows were the freed; and the dog-like the lay-brethren; the fourth and seventh, that is the preachers of the faith and the believers, the cheating missionaries, and the duped people are the same in both divisions.

The power of the order enlarged into three provinces, namely, Jebel, Kuhistan, and Syria.

The first founder of secret societies in the heart of Islamism, Abdollah Maimun, the son of Kaddah, established seven degrees of his doctrine, for which reason, as well as their opinions concerning the seven Imams, his disciples obtained the bye-name of Seveners. This appellation, which had been assigned, hitherto, to the western Ismailites, although they had increased the number of grades from seven to nine, was, with greater justice, transferred to their new branch, the eastern Ismailites or Assassins, whose founder, Hassan, the son of Sabah, not only restored the grades to their original number, seven, but also sketched out for the Dais, or missionaries, a particular rule of conduct, consisting of seven points, which had reference, not so much to the gradual enlightenment of those who were to be taught, as to the necessary qualifications of the teachers; and was the proper rubric of the order.

The first rule was called "The knowledge of the calling" or of initiation.

The second "The gaining of confidence."

The third "The trial by scrupulous examination and questions."

The fourth "Prescribes a form of oath called Ahd, enjoining in the most solemn manner secrecy and obedience to superiors."

The fifth "Teddlis" taught the concordance of their doctrines

and opinions with those of the Magnates of Church and State. This rule was framed with a view to excite Ambition and to fire youth with the example of the rich and powerful.

The sixth, Tessiss (i. e. *confirmation*), merely recapitulated all that had preceded, in order to confirm and strengthen the learner's faith. After this followed, in the seventh place, Teevil (i. e. *the allegorical instruction*), which was the conclusion of the course of atheistical instruction. In Teevil, the allegorical explanation, in opposition to Tensil, or the literal sense of the divine word, was the principal essence of the secret doctrine, from which they were named Bateni, the Esoterics, to distinguish them from the Jaheri, or followers of the outward worship. By means of this crafty system of exposition and interpretation, which, in our own days, has often been applied to the Bible, articles of faith and duties became mere allegories; the external form, merely contingent; the inner sense alone, essential; the observance, or non-observance of religious ordinances and moral laws, matters of indifference.

For a long period, the Assassins have only been known to Europe by the accounts of the Crusaders, and recent historians have dated their appearance in Syria later than it really took place. They, however, appeared in Palestine contemporaneously with the Crusaders; for, already, in the first year of the twelfth century of the Christian era, Jenaheddevlet, Prince of Emessa, fell beneath their daggers as he was hastening to the relief of the castle of the Kurds, Hossnal a-kurd, which was besieged by the Count St. Gilles. Four years before he had been attacked, by three Persian assassins, in his palace, as he was preparing for his devotions. Suspicion, as the author of this attempt, fell upon Riswan, Prince of Aleppo, the political opponent of Jenaheddevlet, and a great friend of the Assassins, who had gained him over by the agency of one of their emissaries, a physician, who was also an astrologer, and thus doubly qualified to deceive himself and others, without having recourse to the false doctrine of his order.

Sultan Sadjar had exhibited tokens of forbearance towards the Assassins; for on his journey from Khorassan to Irak, he visited at Damaghan the Reis Mosaffer, venerable both on account of his age and influence, who, as we have already seen, had declared himself an adherent of Hassan Sabah, and had obtained for him, by stratagem, the treasures of the Emir David Habeshi. Some officers proposed to demand them back, but on Mosaffer's representation, that he had always loaded the inhabitants of the place with favours, as the proper subjects of the sultan, Reis Mosaffer, respected and honoured as the patriarch of the new doctrine, at the age of one hundred and one, died at Damaghan in 1104 A.D.

Hassan Sabah survived the most faithful of his disciples, and his nearest relations, to whom the ties of attachment and consanguinity seemed to secure the highest rights to the succession to the sovereignty. His nephew and grand-prior in Syria, Abulfettah, had fallen by the sword of the enemy; Hossein Kaini grand-prior in Kuhistan, fell under the dagger of a murderer (probably Ostad), one of the two sons of Hassan: and Ostad and his brother fell under the hand of their own father, who seemed to revel even in spilling his own blood. Without proof or measure of guilt, he sacrificed them, not to offended justice, but apparently to mere love of murder, and that terrific policy, in virtue of which the order snapped, all ties of relationship or friendship, to bind the more closely, those of impiety and slaughter.

Ostad (i. e. *the master*), probably so called because the public voice had destined him as the successor of his father as grand-master, was put to death on the mere suspicion of being concerned in Hossein's murder; and his brother was slain, because he had drunk wine: the former, probably, because he had, by his crime, which was without orders, interfered with his father's prerogative; the latter, because he had infringed one of the least essential laws of Islamism, but whose strict observance was part of the system of the order. In the execution of his

two sons, the grand-master gave the profane and the initiated a sanguinary example of avenged disobedience to the ordinance of outward worship, and the rules of internal discipline.

Mewdud, the prince of Mossul, fell under the daggers of the Assassins at Damascus as he was walking with Togebrin, the Prince of that city on a feast day in the fore court of the great Mosque. An Assassin stabbed him, for which he lost his head on the spot.

The less the designs of the Ismailites prospered by the sword, the more successful and persevering were they with the dagger; and however dangerous to the order the times might be, they were not the less so to its most powerful adversaries. A long series of great and celebrated men, during the grand-mastership of Kiabusurgomid, fell by the poinards of his Fedavi, signalised the bloody annals of his reign; and, as formerly, according to the fashion of Oriental historians, there follows, at the end of each prince's reign, a catalogue of the great statesmen, generals, and literati, who have either adorned it by their lives, or troubled it with their death; so, in the annals of the Assassins, is found the chronological enumeration of celebrated men of all nations, who have fallen the victims of the Ismailites, to the joy of their murderers and the sorrow of the world.

Hitherto their attacks had been directed only against viziers and emirs, and subordinate instruments of the caliph's power; the throne itself, which they were undermining, had remained unstained by the blood of its possessors. The period, however, was now arrived, in which the order dared to seal their doctrine with the blood of those caliphs to whom it was so destructive, and to deprive the successors of the prophet, not merely of their temporal power, but likewise of their lives. The shadow of God on earth, as the caliphs called themselves, was, indeed, a mere shadow of earthly power; and was, when he would have asserted more, sent, by the dagger of the Assassin, to the shades below.

We have seen that the secret doctrine of the Ismailites de-

rived its origin from the lodge at Cairo, long before the foundation of the order of the Assassins; and flourished under the protection of the Fatimites, the rivals of the Assassins, and their competitors for the throne. By a just retribution, this protection of a doctrine of irreligion and immorality was avenged on the Fatimites themselves, by the murderous order which sprung from it. The Egyptian caliph, Abu Ali Manssur, tenth of the Fatimite dynasty (whose founder, Obeidollah, had made the lodge of the secret doctrine a part of his ministerial policy), fell, in the twenty-ninth year of his reign, under the dagger of the Assassin.

The doctrine of the Assassins was enveloped in a veil of the profoundest mystery, and ostensibly its maintainers appeared only as strict observers of the rites of Islamism. A proof of this is afforded by the answer given to the envoy of Sultan Sandjar, who had been sent from Rei to collect official information concerning the Ismailitic doctrines. He was told by the superiors, "Our doctrine is as follows:—We believe in the unity of God, and consider that, only as true wisdom, which accords with His word, and the commands of the prophet; we observe these, as they are given in the holy book of the Koran; we believe in all that the prophet has taught concerning the creation and the last day, rewards and punishments, the judgment and the resurrection. We believe that it is necessary so to do, and no one is permitted to pass his judgment on God's commands, or even to alter a letter of them. These are the fundamental rules of our sect; and if the Sultan approves them not, he may send one of his theologians to enter into polemical discussions on the subject."

What William, Bishop of Tyre, and James, Bishop of Acca, on the occasion of an embassy, despatched from the Old Man of the Mountain to the King of Jerusalem, in the year 1172, relate concerning the origin, system, and discipline of the Assassins, agrees very well with that we have derived from oriental sources. "The Assassins," say they, "were formerly the strictest observers of the laws of Mohammedanism, till the

epoch when a grand master of genius and erudition, and intimately acquainted with the Christian tenets, and the doctrine of the Gospel, abolished the prayers of Mohammed, annulled the fasts, and allowed all, without distinction, to drink wine and eat pork. The fundamental rule of their religion, consists in blind submission to their abbot, by which alone they could attain eternal life. This lord and master, who is generally called the Old Man, resides in the Persian province, lying beyond Bagdad (Jebal or Irak-Ajemi). There (at Alamut) young men are educated in the secret tenets and pleasures, instructed in various languages, and then sent, armed with their daggers, throughout the world, to murder Christians and Saracens without distinction; either from hatred, as being enemies of their order, or to please its friends, or for the sake of a rich reward. Those who had sacrificed their lives in the fulfilment of this duty, were adjudged to greater happiness in Paradise, as being martyrs; their surviving relations were loaded with gifts, or, if slaves, set at liberty. Thus was the world overrun by these miserably misled youths, who devoted to murder, issued joyfully from their brethren's convent, to execute the sanguinary commands they had received; appearing in different forms and disguises, sometimes as monks, sometimes as merchants; in fact, in such a variety of shapes, and with so much prudence and caution, that it was impossible for the destined victims to escape their daggers." . . .

Rashideddin Abulhasher Sinan, son of Suleiman, of Basra, pretended that he was himself an incarnation of the Deity. He never showed himself but in coarse dresses of hair; he was never seen to eat, or drink, or sleep, or spit. From the top of a rock he preached to the people from sunrise to sunset, and was long considered by his audience as a superior being. When, however, they discovered that he limped, from having been wounded by a stone in a great earthquake, A.D. 1157, he was near losing both the sanctity of his character, and his life, the people wishing to murder him as an impostor. He exhorted them to patience, descended from the rock, where he had

preached so long as a Stylite, invited his hearers to a banquet, and succeeded, by the power of his eloquence, in inducing them unanimously to swear obedience and fealty to him as their superior. He seized the moment when the grand master of the Ismailites in Persia had exposed all the mysteries, and by that means sapped the foundations of the order, to envelope himself in the halo of an apostle, and confirm his dominion in Syria.

For this reason he is unanimously considered by oriental historians as the chief of the Ismailitic doctrine in Syria; and even to this day his writings are esteemed canonical by the Ismailites still remaining in that country. They consist of a shapeless chaos of contradictory articles of faith, which probably are all to be understood only allegorically; a host of mutilated passages from the Koran and the Gospels, hymns, litanies, sermons, prayers, and ritual ordinances. These can hardly have been preserved in their original purity, but must have descended to us intermixed with the superstition and ignorance of later centuries, like the books of the Druses, who, now as little acquainted as the Ismailites with the spirit of their founder, possess but a very imperfect knowledge of their original dogmas, and have lost the tradition of the allegorical doctrine.

The secret offer made by the grand prior of the Assassins that he and his followers would undergo baptism, providing the Templars, their nearest neighbours on the mountains, would release them from the annual impost of two thousand ducats, and live in brotherly love and peace with them was frustrated by an untoward event.

In the centre of the Persian, as well as of the Assyrian territory of the Assassins, that is to say, both at Alamut and Massiat, were situated, in a space surrounded by walls, splendid gardens—true eastern paradises.

The music of the harp was mingled with the songs of birds, and the melodious tones of the female singers harmonised with the murmur of the brooks. Everything breathed pleasure, rapture, and sensuality.

A youth, who was deemed worthy, by his strength and resolution, to be initiated into the Assassin service, was invited to the table and conversation of the grand master, or grand prior; he was then intoxicated with *hashishe*, and carried into the garden, which, on awakening he believed to be paradise; every thing around him, the houris in particular, contributed to confirm his delusion. After he had experienced as much of the pleasures of paradise which the prophet has promised to the blessed, as his strength would admit, after quaffing enervating delight from the eyes of the houris, and intoxicating wine from the glittering goblets, he sunk into the lethargy produced by narcotic draughts, on awakening from which, after a few hours, he again found himself by the side of his superior. The latter endeavoured to convince him that corporeally he had not left his side, but that spiritually he had been wrapped into paradise, and had then enjoyed a foretaste of the bliss which awaits the faithful, who devote their lives to the service of the faith, and the obedience of their chiefs. Thus did these infatuated youths blindly dedicate themselves as the tools of murder, and eagerly sought an opportunity to sacrifice their lives, in order to become partakers of a paradise of sensual pleasure. What Mohammed had promised in the Koran to the Moslimin, but which to many might appear a dream and mere empty promises, they had enjoyed in reality; and the joys of heaven animated them to deeds worthy of hell. This imposture could not remain undiscovered; and the fourth grand master, after unveiling all the mysteries of impiety to the people, probably revealed also to them the joys of paradise, which could besides, have but little charms for them, to whom already everything was permitted on earth. That which hitherto had served as a means to produce pleasure, became now itself an object; and the effects of the intoxication of opium, were the earnest of celestial delights which they wanted strength to enjoy.

To this day Constantinople and Cairo show what an incredible charm opium with henbane exerts on the drowsy indolence of the Turk, and the fiery imagination of the Arab; and explains

the fury with which these youths sought the enjoyment of these rich pastiles *(hashishe)*, and the confidence produced in them, so that they are able to undertake anything or everything. From the use of these pastiles, they were called *Hashishin* (herb-eaters),* which, in the mouths of the Greeks and Crusaders, has been transformed into the word Assassin; and, as synonymous with murder, has immortalised the history of the order in all the languages of Europe.

In A.D. 1253, and the year of the Hegira 651, Tandju Newian, the general of Mangu Khan, who covered the frontiers of Iran, sent to his master the ambassadors of the caliph of Bagdad, who complained of the atrocities of the Assassins, and besought him to extirpate the vile race. Their complaints were seconded by those of the judge of Kaswin, who was at the Khan's court, and went in armour to the audience, fearing the daggers of the Assassins, against whose crimes he raised the voice of humanity. Mangu immediately collected an army, which he placed under the command of his brother, Hulaku.

The last grand master of the order of Assassins was Rockneddin. After an existence of nearly two centuries, the crimes of this organised association of murderers, which had long been filling to overflowing the cup of retributive vengeance, drew down on them the wrath of heaven.

The tempest of destruction came suddenly and unexpectedly on the Assassins in all their strongholds. The Mogul power of Zinghis Khan, thundering in the distance, had passed inocuously over their heads, but under the third of his successors, Mangu Khan, the whirlwind of Mogul conquest swept over the eastern world, and in its progress, carried away, along with the Caliphate of Bagdad, other thrones and dynasties, and the power of the Assassins.

At the end of the fifth century of the Hegira, about 1078 A.D.,

* See the circumstantial proof of this indubitable genealogy, in the Memoire sur la Dynastie des Assassins, et sur l'Origine de leur Nom; by M. Silvestre de Sacy: read at the Institute, 7th July, 1809. And a letter of M. Silvestre de Sacy to the Editor of the Moniteur, on the Etymology of the name of the Assassins.—Moniteur, No. 359, year 1809.

the deluge of the Assassins inundated the whole of Asia; and at the end of the sixth, Zinghis Khan rushed on like a hurricane, and the earth quaked under the hoofs of the Moguls. The rage of the tempest afterwards spread through all Asia, and the shocks of the earthquake carried their ruin as far as Europe.

Mangu had issued the command to Hulaku, to exterminate all the Ismailites, and not to spare even the infant at its mother's breast; and immediately on Rokneddin's departure, the sanguinary task was commenced, which had only been delayed till Kirdkuh, and the remainder of the castles of the Assassins in Kuhistan and Syria should have fallen. He sent one of his viziers to Kaswin, to put to death indiscriminately, Rokneddin's wives, children, brothers, sisters and slaves; only two relations (females apparently) of Rokneddin, were selected from this devoted band, not for mercy, but to be the victims of the princess, Bulghan Khatun's private revenge, her father, Jagatai, having bled by the Assassin's daggers. A command, similar to that given to the governor of Kaswin, was issued to the viceroy of Khorassan. He assembled the captive Ismailites, and twelve thousand of those wretched creatures were slaughtered without distinction of age. Warriors went through the provinces, and executed the fatal sentence without mercy or appeal. Wherever they found a disciple of the doctrine of the Ismailites, they compelled him to kneel down, and then cut off his head. The whole race of Kia Busurgomid, in whose descendants the grand mastership had been hereditary, were exterminated. The "devoted to murder," were not now the victims of the order's vengeance, but that of outraged humanity. The sword was against the dagger, the executioner destroyed the murderer. The seed, sowed for two centuries, was now ripe for the harvest, and the field ploughed by the Assassin's dagger was repeated by the sword of the Mogul. The crime had been terrible, but no less terrible was the punishment.

The castles of the Assassins in Rudbar and Kuhistan, Kain Tun, Lamsir, and even Alamut, the capital, were now in the

hands of the victor. Kirdkuh alone, in the district of Damaghan, whose garrison had been encouraged not to yield, by Rokneddin, when on his way to Mangu, resisted the besieging forces of the Moguls for three years.

The princes of Ruyan and Masenderam having done homage to the overwhelming power of Hulaku Khan, received his commands to besiege Kirdkuh, while he was engaged in his expedition against Bagdad. Hulaku Khan promised himself a large result from the wisdom of his measures, in imposing upon them both the conduct of the siege of Kirdkuh.

The two Princes, without waiting for the Khan's permission, raised the siege and marched home, unmindful of the wrath of Hulaku Khan, of which they soon felt the weight.

After the fall of Alamut, the residence of the grand-master of the assassins, and the centre of the order, Atamelik Jowaini, the learned vizier and historian, asked and obtained from Hulaku, permission to search the celebrated library and archives of the order, for the purpose of saving the works which might be worthy of the khan's preserving. He laid aside the Koran and some other precious books, and committed to the flames, not only all the philosophical and sceptical works, containing the Ismailite doctrine, and written in harmony with it, but also all the mathematical and astronomical instruments, and thus at once destroyed every source from which history might have derived a more circumstantial account of the dogmas of the Ismailites, and the statutes of the order. Fortunately, in his own history, he preserved the results of the information which he derived from the library and archives of the order, together with a biographical sketch of Hassan Sabah, from which all the more modern Persian historians, as Mirkhond, have collected their stories, and which we have followed.

After the castles of the assassins in Kudbar and Kuhistan had been razed to the ground, numbers of the order massacred, and a still greater number scattered, they still maintained their stand for fourteen years in the mountains of Syria against the armies of the Monguls, the Franks, and the Egyptian Sultan

Bibars. In the year 1269 A. D. when Sultan Bibars was marching against the Franks, in Syria, the commanders of the different towns appeared to do him homage. Nejmeddin, the grand-master of the Assassins, however, instead of following this example, requested a diminution of the tribute, which the order now paid to the Sultan instead of the Franks. Saremeddin Mobarek, the commandant of the Ismailite fortress, Alika, had formerly drawn upon himself the anger of the sultan; but having received pardon on the intercession of the governor of Sihinn, or, according to others, of Hama, he appeared with a numerous suite, in Bibar's presence, who received him into favour and loaded him with honours. He granted him the supreme command of all the castles of the Ismailites in Syria, which were no longer to be governed by Nejm eddin, but by Saremeddin, in the name of the Sultan of Egypt.

In the meanwhile, in 1270 A.D. Saremeddin having taken possession of Massiat, drove out Aseddin, the governor named by the Sultan; but not being able to maintain the place against the approaching forces of the Sultan, he threw himself into the castle of Alika.

Nejmeddin, the former grand-prior, again held the command of the Ismailite castles in Syria, in the name of the Sultan, by whom Shemseddin was retained at court, as the pledge of his father's fidelity. Bibars eventually caused Shemseddin and all his suite to be arrested, and carried into Egypt. At the same time, two officers of the order, who had persuaded their friends in the castle of Khawabi, to surrender to the Sultan, were seized at Sarmin. This castle surrendered to negotiation, that of Kolaia to force; and, in the following year, those of Menifa and Kadmus fell into the sultan's hands.

From this moment, Bibars was master of all the forts and castles which had been in the possession of the Ismailites; and he ruined their power in Syria, as Hulaku had done in Persia. Next to Massiat, the residence of the grand-master, Shiun, a strong place on a rock, abundantly supplied with water, and at a short day's journey from Latakia, had been

lately particularly distinguished, by the valiant exploits of its commandant, Hamsa, one of the greatest heroes among the Syrian Ismailites. This Hamsa must not be confounded with Hamsa, the companion of the prophet, and one of the bravest heroes of Mohammedanism; nor with Hamsa, the founder of the religion of the Druses. The numerous battles and enterprises of the Assassins, their valorous defence against the armies of the Crusaders, and the Egyptian sultan, Bibars, and the adventurous character of their whole history, offered a fertile source to the Syrian romance writers and story-tellers; a source of which they did not fail to avail themselves.

The conquest of Massiat was succeeded by that of Alika, and, at length, two years after, by that of Kahaf, Mainoka Kadmus, and of the other castles on the Antilebanon; and thus the power of the Ismailites was overthrown, both in Syria and Persia. One of their last attempts at assassination is said to have been directed against the person of St. Louis, King of France, but the falsity of this supposition has already been demonstrated, by French writers.

The power of the Ismailites had now terminated, both in Persia and Syria; the citadels of the grand-master, in Rudbar, and of the grand-priors, in Kuhistan and Syria, had fallen; the bands of the Assassins were massacred and scattered: their doctrine was publicly condemned, yet, nevertheless, continued to be secretly taught, and the order of the Assassins, endured long after its suppression. In Kuhistan, in particular, remains of them still existed.

Remains of the Ismailites still exist both in Persia and Syria, but merely as one of the many sects and heresies of Islamism, without any claims to power, without the means of obtaining their former importance, of which they seem, in fact, to have lost all remembrance. The policy of the secret state-subverting doctrine of the first lodge of the Ismailites, and the murderous tactics of the Assassins, are equally foreign to them. Their writings are a shapeless mixture of Ismailite and Christian traditions, glossed over with the ravings of the mystic theology.

Their places of abode are, both in Persia and Syria, those of their forefathers, in the mountains of Irak, and at the foot of Antilebanon.

The Persian Ismailites recognise, as their chief, an imam, whose descent they deduce from Ismael the son of Jafer-Essadik, and who resides at Khekh, a village in the district of Kum, under the protection of the shah. As, according to their doctrine, the Imam is an incarnate emanation of the Deity, the Imam of Khekh enjoys, to this day, the reputation of miraculous powers; and the Ismailites, some of whom are dispersed as far as Innia, go in pilgrimage, from the banks of the Ganges and the Indus, in order to share his benediction. The castles in the district of Rudbar, in the mountains of Kuhistan, particularly in the vicinity of Alamut, at the end of the last century, were still inhabited, to this day, by Ismailites, who, according to a late traveller, go by the general name of Hosseinis.

The Syrian Ismailites live in eighteen villages, dispersed round their ancient chief place, Massiat, and are under the rule of a sheikh or emir, who is the nominee of the governor of Hamah. Being clothed in a pelisse of honour, he engages to pay to Hamah an annual sum of sixteen thousand five hundred piastres: his vassals are divided into two parties, the Suweidani and Khisrewi: the former so named after one of their former sheikhs; the latter, for their extraordinary veneration of the prophet Khiser (Elias), the guardian of the spring of life: the former, who are by far the smaller number, live principally at Feudara, one of the eighteen places under the jurisdiction of Massiat.

The Nossairis, or Nasarieyhs, the neighbours and enemies of the Ismailites, possessed themselves, by treachery, of their chief fortress, Massiat; the inhabitants were pillaged and murdered; the booty amounted to more than a million piastres, in value. The governor of Hamah did not suffer this rash enterprise of the Nossairis to go unpunished; he besieged Massiat, and compelled them to resign the fortress to its ancient possessors; the latter, however, sunk into complete political insignificance.

Externally they practice the duties of Islamism with austerity, although they internally renounce, them: they believe in the divinity of Ali; in uncreated light as the principle of all created things; and in the Sheikh Rashideddin, the grand-prior of the order in Syria, contemporary with the grand-master, Hassan II., as the last representative of the Deity on earth.

We shall mention here, in passing, as they are neighbours of the Ismailites, that the Nossairis, the Metewellis, and the Druses, three sects anathematized by the Moslems, on account of their infidelity and impiety have some secret affinities. Their doctrine agrees, in many points, with that of the Ismailites; their founders having been animated with the same spirit of extravagant fanaticism,—of unprincipled licentiousness. The Nossairis and Druses are both older in their origin than the eastern Ismailites; the former having appeared in Syria, as a branch of the Karmathites, as early as the fifth century of the Hegira; the latter received their laws from Hamsa, a missionary of Hakembiemillah's from the lodge of Cairo. The former believe, like the Ismailites, in the incarnation of the divinity in Ali; the latter consider that maddest of tyrants, Hakembiemillah, as a god in the flesh. Both abjure all the rules of Islamism, or only observe them in appearance; both hold secret and nocturnal assemblies stigmatized by the Moslimin, where they give themselves up to the enjoyment of wine and promiscuous intercourse.

The origin and doctrine of the Metewelli is less known than that of the Nossairis and Druses. Their name is corrupted from Metewilin, the *interpreters*; and therefore, probably, indicates a sect of the Ismailites, who taught the *Tenvil*, or allegorical interpretation of the commands of Islamism, in opposition to the *Tensil*, or positive letter of the word, not from God, the sense of which is a command to the true believer.

The reproach of immorality, which these sects share in common, is certainly much more applicable to the Metewellis than to their neighbours. For the inhabitants of the village of Martaban, on the road from Latakia to Aleppo, who are sin-

gularly vitiated and depraved, are Metewellis. In still worse report than the Ismailites, Metewellis, Nassairis and Druses, are some tribes of Syrian and Assyrian kurds, who are called Yezidis, because they hold in peculiar veneration Yezid, the khalif of the Ommia family, who persecuted, sanguinarily, the family of the prophet, and likewise propitiated the devil, and never cursed him like other Moslimin. Their sheikh is called Karàbash, that is, Blackhead, because he covers his head with a black scarf. The name of their founder is Sheikh Hadi, who, according to opinion, prayed, fasted, and gave alms for all his future disciples; so that they believed themselves exempted from these duties of Mohammedanism, and that, in consideration of his merits, they will go to heaven without appearing before the tribunal of God.

All these still existing sects are designated by the Moslimin, generally, Sindike (*freethinkers*), Mulhad (*impious*), and Batheni (*esoterics*), and, on account of their nocturnal assemblies, sometimes the one, sometimes the other, receive from the Turks the name of *Mumsoindiren*, or the *extinguishers*; because, according to the accusations of their religious adversaries, they extinguish the lights, for purposes of debauchery.

The ostensible object of the institution of the lodge of Ismailite Illuminati at Cairo, was in itself sufficiently laudable, and the exoteric doctrine had merely for its avowed object the extension of knowledge, and the mutual support of the members. The house of science, at Cairo, or the public school of the lodge, was the temple of the sciences, and the model of all acadamies; the greater number of the members were certainly deceived into good faith by the fair exterior of a beneficent, philanthropical, knowledge-spreading form; they were a kind of Freemasons, whose native country, as we have seen, may really be sought and found in Egypt, if not in the most ancient times, at least in the history of the middle ages. As in the west, revolutionary societies arose from the bosom of the Freemasons, so in the east, did the Assassins spring from the Ismailites.

The dominion of the Assassins sunk under the iron tramp of

the Mogul General, Kulaku. Their fall drew after it that of the ancient throne of the Caliph of Bagdad and of other dynasties.

In writing the history of the Assassins, the object of the author was to present a lively picture of the pernicious influence of secret societies in countries whose governments are weak or wicked, and of the dreadful prostitution of religion to the vile interests of unprincipled ambition.*

"The extermination of the Assassins or Ishmaelians of Persia (says Gibbon), by Holagan Khan, the grand-son of Zinghis Khan, may be considered as a service to mankind. Among the hills to the south of the Caspian, these odious sectaries had reigned with impunity above a hundred and sixty years; and their prince, or Imam, established his lieutenant to lead and govern the colony of Mount Lebanon, so famous and formidable in the history of the Crusades. With the fanaticism of the Koran, the Ismaelians had blended the Indian transmigration, and the visions of their own prophets; and it was their first duty to devote their souls and bodies in blind obedience to the vicar of God. The daggers of his missionaries were felt both in the East and West; the Christians and the Moslems enumerate, and perhaps multiply, the illustrious victims that were sacrificed to the zeal, avarice or resentment, of "the old man," as he was corruptly styled "of the mountain." But these daggers, his only arms, were broken by the sword of Holagan, and not a vestige left of the enemies of mankind, except the word *assassin*, which in the most odious sense has been adopted in the languages of Europe."

* The preceding details of the origin, practices, career, and fall of the Order Assassins, are taken mainly from the "History of the Assassins," by Von Hammer.

CHAPTER VIII.

The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Ansayrii.

Maundrell, in " His journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem," in 1797, 5th Ed. Ox. p. 12, 8vo. makes mention of a remarkable tribe he met with near Jebilee, a town in a mountainous district that runs along the coast, not far from Latakia:—" Above Jebilee (says Maundrell) there dwell a people called by the Turks " Neceres " of a very strange and singular character. It is their principle to adhere to no certain religion, but chameleon like, they put on the color of religion whatever it is, which is reflected on them from the persons with whom they happen to converse. With Christians they profess themselves Christians: with Turks they are good Mussulmans; with Jews they pass for Jews; being such Proteuses in religion, that nobody was ever able to discover of what shape or standard their consciences are; all that is certain concerning them is, they make good wine, and are great drinkers."

Several travellers ascribe the same obscene rites and idolatrous practices to the Druses, in general which Warbuton ascribes to the Nasairi and Quadri-Mousi: "The Nasairi (says Warburton) performed daily the most obscene worship, the latter are supposed to adore a golden Calf, as the Persians do Ahriman, the origin of evil; this calf symbolizing Eblis, the spirit at issue, with that of the Hakim."

The Druses are divided into two ranks—the initiated, who are made acquainted with the mysteries of their religion, admitted into the sacred assemblies, are supposed to be "spiritual" and self-concentrated, of an interior life, are called Fawil; the vulgar, or people at large, uninitiated, those whose minds are occupied with external things and objects of sense are called Teizel.

Between the two, novices hold a sort of middle rank, they were named "Nasairi" and also "Quadri-Mousi."

The former I suppose are the people of whom Maundrell makes mention under the name of Neseres.

"Volney mentions that the Ansayrii are divided into several classes, among which we may distinguish the Shemsia, or adorers of the Sun; the Kelbia, or worshippers of the Moon; the Kadmousee, who, as I am assured, worship woman.

"On Ansayrii and the Assassins—Travels in the Further East in 1850-51," (published in two vols. 8vo) is the title of a remarkable work written by the Hon. F. Walpole, R. N., the production of a gentleman, a tolerant Christian, an enlightened English traveller, with a rare talent for conciliating the people amongst whom he travelled, and obtaining from them information which foreigners, especially Englishmen, find it exceedingly difficult to procure in Syria.

In this work we have most valuable information respecting a people of whom previously we knew very little, of their religion nothing at all. I do not concur in the views of Mr. Walpole as to the connection of the Ansayrii with the Assassins of Syria. but I am sensible of the value of the information he has collected respecting them, and I beg to call particular attention to it as affording strong testimony in favour of the opinion I entertain that their religious tenets and superstitions are derived from the Druses, who must be looked upon as the only true representatives in Syria of the Ishmailian sect of the followers of Ali from whom the Assassins are derived.

"Avoiding the crowded and slippery streets I skirted the town, passed the mosque of St. George, formerly the church of

the same name, and crossing the Nahr el Beyrout, descended to the beach which stretches six or seven miles away in a bold sweep, until it runs to the point forming the south side of the Nahr el Kelb. The mountains above rise in graceful beauty, thickly sprinkled with Druse and Maronite villages, while here and there a convent rises like a pinnacle, in strong position; this is the mountain district of the south, which is bounded by the Nahr El Kelb on the north, and inhabited by a mixed population of Druses and Christians."*

The province of Kesrowan is the principal stronghold of the Maronites. Except a few christians of other sects, there are no other inhabitants."

"There is a constant feud between the Arabs and the Ansayrii; I mean these Fellah Arabs of the sea coast, for they tell me they never crossed the mountains, but winter and summer abode in that plain."

"The Ansayrii assured me to-day they never taught their religion to their women. 'Would you have us teach them,' he said, 'whom we use, our holy faith?' The Ansayrii are now, also, from all I could gather, divided into several sects; for interpreting to him several tenets of Zoroaster, he appeared to be struck with my knowledge, they always parry me by 'Your faith, my Lord Frankmason?' (Freemason).

At the Kalaat of Kadmous, Walpole gives an insight into the manners of the interior life of the Kadmousee. "At the door was an old man with a loaded pistol; he watched there day by day ready to fire the alarm on the smallest trace of danger, for the Ismaylee, though nominally at peace, are in perpetual dread of an attack from the Ansayrii . . .

"They all maintained they were strict and conscientious followers of the Prophet, though, as we shall see, I got one of them afterwards to contradict himself in this. Their Mosque had no domes, the roof was flat, but the door seemed closed, and the whole had an air as if little frequented.

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. iii, p. 3.—10.

"The Ameer of the Kadmousee told us that their people, numbering 20,000 fighting men, came—I think he said 27,000 people in all—from Damascus 846 years ago; say 1010 A.D.: that they fought with and drove out the Ansayrii from the castles of the mountains, from Kalaat el Kadmous, Kalaat el Kohf, el Aleyka, el Mazzyad, el Hosen, el Merkab, el Mehalbee, el Sion, el Ailaka, and numerous others he mentioned, whose names I forgot; that several of these, such as Merkab, Sion, Mehalbee, and Hosen, had been again retaken by Melek el Daher. If this was the son of Saladin, 1193 A.D., they did not enjoy many of their conquests long.

"Volney ascribes the Ansayrii religion to the year 891 A.D., and the chronology may be correct. They now possess Kalaat el Mazzyad, el Kadmous, el Kohf, el Aleyka, and el Merkab, and according to their own account, number 4,000 fighting men. They have villages also in the district of Mazzyard, of Kadmous, of Mawary, and I heard of a few also in Djebel Acra, north of Tripoli.

"At Kadmous there are two Montselims, the Ameer Assad Heisin Kabeel, and the Montselim of the castle, and the Ameer Selin Assed; these are cousins; they were our kind hosts. Their cousin the Ameer Melkein commands at Mazzyad." . . .

"At this period they were called Salleha Hireb, or "The Righteousness of Job." Asserting they are descendants of Ismael, son of Abraham, the beloved, they style themselves Beni Ismaeli: hence Ismaylee. Their other appellations, Kadmousie, or Khodansee are given them from Kadmous. The name Mokledjye means robber: hence a family village, or set, who are noted robbers, receive the name; but it is given to no sect: the Turks would use the term probably for all the mountaineers who resist their exactions.

"Volney mentions the Kadmousie as a sect of the Ansayrii, but the two people have no personal resemblance, and hold each other in abhorrence. In fact either sect have told me the other was their natural enemy, and that it was right and their duty to slay them.

"At Kadmous, the Ansayrii, who have some villages in the district, whenever they visit the Ameer, are disarmed at the outer gate. The Ansayrii have told me, that, in former times, the Kadmousie slew a great religious chief of theirs, and this made a feud which no blood, no money can efface.

"The Ameer told me on a visit he paid me afterwards at Latakia, that they had persons of their sect not only at Killis, but in the country around Mosul; that they were known as Koords and Turcoman people; that like themselves, here fearing the persecution of the Turks, they nominally are Mussulmans, and when in town conform to the outward forms of their sect. His remarks on their faith shewed, that if a Mussulman, he at least did not fear to curse the Prophet." . . .

"They say they are descended from Ishmael, the son of Abraham the beloved; that they left Damascus A.D. 1010: the case was, that they were persecuted; this they own now." . . .

"In the year A.D. 999, the Hakem reigned in Egypt, the Hakem-b-amr-illah governing by the order of God, as he styled himself; soon came from Persia, Mohammed-ben-Ismael, (Mohammed son of Ishmael), who was styled the Hakem-Hakem-b-amr-eh, governing by his own order. This the Druses say, was the second meeting of Ormuzd and Ahriman, the two principles of good and evil, or darkness."

The Ansayrii are divided into two parties, the Shemsin and the Clausee. The one have Sheik Habeel, Sheik Abbas, and Sheik Ibrahim Saide for their spiritual heads; with them the priesthood is hereditary, and has been so for generations. The Shemsia have Sheik Abdullah, of Demsuko, Sheik Sulieman, and another, I believe, north, by Antioch, as their heads. Their feuds are of perhaps two hundred years' standing, and as the doctrines maintained on either side are not demonstrable, by direct proof or acknowledged writ, they can never be arranged. These two parties hold no communication, and are often at war.

"The present feud was actively inflamed by a man of the Drousee carrying off a ploughing ox from the other party; this

produced a reprisal; this a fight, and so on. Both sides see the great folly of the war, yet both refuse to come to any terms. Things were at this juncture when Sheik Abdallah, of Kerneen, came and entreated my interference. I went with him alone, thinking it best not to have servants, and we reached the house of Shemseen Sultan, at a little before daylight. Here we heard that on the previous evening, Shemseen had been sent for, and was now on the field of battle, some five hours further in the mountains.

"In about four hours we heard firing, and turned to the house whence it came. A noble valley lay before us, and up this we rode along the bed of a mountain stream, the scenery the wildest imaginable. The firing was now close to us, but we saw nobody; proceeding further we came upon a poor woman; she had fallen down between two rocks, and there lay moaning,—painfully with each moan her heart's blood welled out from a dreadful wound, just below the right breast. With the cloth from my loins I bound it up, pressing a pad of stone tight over the wound, and placing her in the shade, within reach of water, in as comfortable a position as the time would allow. By this time the firing was pretty close; luckily the gully was deep, so we were completely protected. The Sheik rather reproved me for taking so much care of a woman.

"Suddenly about a hundred men made their appearance from the covert where before they had been concealed. These, we found were a party of Drousee, who had been despatched from the main force to burn a village just before us; that by some means their march had been discovered, and they had lost four men and the poor woman, who had come with her husband to carry bread to Leban. Finding they were worsted, they had fled across the valley up which we had ridden, and there had made a stand under cover of the bushes. They had left all their dead and wounded but one, and this was a noble-looking young fellow, to whom they led me.

"Sheik Abdallah and myself again descended the valley, and mounted the opposite side, where we found full three hundred

men. It had been no difficult matter to persuade the beaten party to retire from a fight they were anxious to quit; but with the victors it was different.

"In the evening I reached the head quarters, and found about nine hundred men on a ridge, in face, as they said, of about five thousand, though probably of about the same number, Sheik Shemseen was there; his jolly, social, easy nature quite put out by his difficulties; and as he told me, fighting one's self was much easier than preventing others from fighting. The sheiks of the Drousee were invited to meet and make a conference, but they refused. At last, however, they agreed, if hostages were given, and I went over and remained with them. They treated me most hospitably, and put no restraint whatever upon me, even accompanying me over to the other party. On the following day the sheiks returned, but no terms would they agree to.

"In my interview with the sheiks of the Drousee, the women were the most violent advocates for war; many were perfectly furious. 'Are our breasts without milk? Can we have no more children? Are we sheep that we are to be driven without biting? Your beard is white, you, sheik keep at home; the youths and the men will go to the fight. And you—you, Bey, —your hand was made for the sword, your body for the war,— not to talk, like a greybeard.' Even the children yelled at me. 'You wish us to be eaten with your peace; if you love us, lead us to the fray.' Girls said, 'Do you love the young girl? Go and fight bravely, and deserve her; she will not come to the coward. The faint hearted is a poor lover.' The young men seemed less wild than these Amazons. . . .

"The term Ansayrii seems at least as ancient as Pliny, who says (Hist. Plin. v. 23), 'Cæle habet Assamiam Marsya amne divisam à naycrinorum tetrarchia.' This would give them an antiquity far beyond any that can be claimed for them; but Pliny was probably correct; so we may suppose the country, or rather mountains, were named as now, then the Ansayrii, and inhabited by another race.

"William of Tyre, mentions a race as met by the Crusaders on their march from Antioch, whom he calls Assassins; they were under a chief, Sheik el Djebel—literally, the old man of the mountain—nor does the devotion they showed at all differ from what they would as readily show to-day.

"Gibbon says:—'But the extirpation of the Assassins, or Ishmalians of Persia, may be considered as a service to mankind. Among the hills to the south of the Caspian, these odious sectarians had reigned with impunity, for above one hundred and sixty years, and their Prince, or Imam established his lieutenant to lead or govern the colony of Mount Libanus, so famous and formidable in the history of the Crusades. With the fanaticism of the Koran these people had blended the Indian's transmigration, and the visions of their own prophet, and it was their first duty to devote their souls and bodies in blind obedience to God.'

"Now these so nearly resemble the doctrines of the Ansayrii, their religion is such a mixture of the Magian and the Mussulman; the names, also, so nearly resemble each other, that perhaps, as yet I only venture to say perhaps, they may claim their right, their name—a byword and reproach among us all.

"The Ansayrii are a fine large race, with more bone and muscle than is generally found in orientals; browner than the Osmanli, but lighter, fairer than the Arab; brown hair is not by any means uncommon. The women, when young are handsome, often fair with light hair, and jet black eyes; or the rarer beauty of fair eyes and coal-black hair, or eyebrows; but exposure to the sun, and the labours they perform, soon wear them out.

"In dress the Ansayrii are Turks. According to the expression of the country they dress thus, as they regard white as their sacred colour, and deem it essential to be clothed in it. The white turban or cloth wrapped voluminously round the tarboosh, is worn by all.

"With the women the dress consists of the white cotton

shirt, hardly differing from the men, a zenaar, or belt, a jacket similar to that of the men, trousers resembling European trousers, save they are slightly fuller; a tarboosh and handkerchief on the head, or more generally a common handkerchief. They never conceal their faces, though they keep retired, except when the stranger is a guest in their houses, and then they will enter freely into conversation.

"The nation, for such it is, being capable of mustering forty thousand warriors able to bear arms, is divided into two classes, sheiks and people; the sheiks again into two, the sheiks, or chiefs of religion, Sheik el Maulen, and the temporal sheiks, or sheiks of government.

"The sheik of religion enjoys great privileges; as a boy he is taught to read and write; he is marked from his fellows from very earliest childhood, by a white handkerchief round his head. Early as his sense will admit he is initiated into the principles of his faith; in this he is schooled and perfected. Early he is taught that death, martyrdom, is a glorious reward, and that sooner than divulge one word, he is to suffer the case in which his soul is enshrined to be mangled or tortured in any way.

"During his priesthood he is strictly to conform to his faith. This forbids him not only eating certain things at any time, but eating at all with any but chiefs of religion; or eating anything purchased with unclean money; and the higher ones carry this to such an extent that they will only eat of their own produce; they will not even touch water, except such as they deem pure and clean.

"Like the Mohammedans, they practice the right of circumcision, performing it at various ages, according to the precocity of the child. The ceremony is celebrated, as among the Turks, with feasting and music.

"I do not yet know if any ceremony exists at the naming of the child. When a candidate is pronounced ready for initiation, his tarboosh is removed, and a white cloth wrapped round

his head. He is then conducted into the presence of the sheiks of religion. The chief proceeds to deliver a lecture, cautioning him against ever divulging their great and solemn secret. "If you are under the sword, the rope, or the torture, die and smile, you are blessed." He then kisses the earth three times before the chief, who continues telling him the articles of their faith. On rising, he teaches him a sign, and delivers three words to him. This completes the first lesson.

"They are allowed four wives. The marriage ceremony is simple, and divorce not permitted. If one of those four wives die, they are permitted to take another. Generally they have little affection for their wives—treating them rather as useful cattle than as rational creatures. They never teach women the smallest portion of their faith.

"Not only are the chiefs particular with regard to their food, but certain restrictions are observed among all. They will not eat or touch pig; they will not eat the meat of an ox or sheep that is blind or lame; some will not touch the meat of a female animal; fowls they eat; they will not eat the meat of an animal shot, unless killed afterwards: of gazelles, their only large animal, they will not eat the female; hares, and all animals that split the hoof, are forbidden; wine and spirits are permitted, but to drink either before Christians or Turks is a sin; while the chiefs only drink wine among themselves, and spirits before their co-religionists.

"They worship Ali. In one of their prayers they say:—'I declare I worship Ali, Ibn Abou Talib (the Ali of Mahommet), he is above all—a God Almighty.'

"They regard Mohammed el Hamyd as the prophet of God, and thus use the Mussulman confession, 'La illa ill Allah, Mohammed el Hamyd, Resoul el nebbi Allah;' but they omit all this when before Mohammedans.

"They believe in the transmigration of souls. Those who in this life do well, are hospitable, and follow their faith, become stars; the souls of others return to the earth, and become An-

sayrii again, until purified they fly to rest. The souls of bad men become Jews, Christians, and Turks, while the souls of those who believe not, become pigs, and other beasts.

"They pray five times a day, saying several prayers each time, turning this way or that, having no kebllah. If a Christian or a Turk sees them at their devotions, the prayers are of no avail. At their feasts they pray in a room closed and guarded from the sight or ingress of the uninitiated."*

No traveller previously to Mr. Walpole, with the exception of Burckhardt, having ever ventured on visiting the mountain villages of the Ansayrii, his account of this remarkable people is very valuable. "Most men (he says) are shy of approaching this district. Burckhardt spent one evening among them; but gives little information, save that on his mentioning having heard of a temple and people of their religion in the East Indies, they appeared much struck, as if there was something in it. In the first place they have no temple or building dedicated to prayer: and except vague stories, do not know whether they have any co-religionists or not."†

The Kaimakan of Latakia has the government of a great portion of the Ansayrii mountains. Among these mountains the taxes are seldom paid, except when a large force can be sent to collect them. There is no law but that of the strongest.

The Ansayrii call themselves Ibn Said Munen, and also Hydereer. The Arabic word "Munen" means belief.

The custom of planting groves over and near the tombs of saints, is practised by the Ansayrii in their mountains. Idolatry in all times has a penchant for perching itself in high places, and surrounding its tombs and sanctuaries with groves. They have the tombs of Mohammedan saints of the sect of Ali, which they hold in great veneration, and make pilgrimages to, and pray before. But their chief protector and patron is "Mohammed el Hamyd, whom Ali bless and consecrate."

Mr. Walpole, at the conclusion of the third volume of his

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. iii.

† Ib. p. 112.

work, comes to a conclusion respecting their religion by no means in accordance with the theory elsewhere adopted by him as to the Hivite origin of their idolatry:—"We shall, I think, find that this religion commenced as a mere sect of the Mussulmans, and that subsequent bitter persecution has led their sheiks or religious heads to deny all parts of the oppressors' creed, and to substitute fresh follies in their stead; that, in fact mysticism was heaped upon mysticism, till they themselves are puzzled in their belief."

A remarkable and accurate notice of the Ansyreeh appeared in an Arabic geography lately printed at Beirout, by the American missionaries. In this work the Ansyreeh are described as a branch of the Karmatian Arabs, whose tribe was located in the deserts of Cufa, of the Arabian Irak. Their name is derived from Karmath, a preacher of a new religion, who appeared at the close of the ninth century (æra of Hegira, 264). This man designated his doctrine "Batin," signifying "Interior," hence his followers were called Batineans. From this sect arose Nusair, an old man of great repute for holiness, for prayer, and fasting. He appointed twelve apostles to preach his doctrine. He was opposed by the sheiks of his tribe, imprisoned in Cufa, and delivered from it by the daughter of the jailor. On his liberation he gave out that he was brought out of prison by an angel. He wrote a book in which he said that he was divinely favoured and commissioned, had seen the Messiah—who is Ahmed, son of Mohammed, the son of Kanafeyah, son of Ali, and the same is Gabriel, the angel. It is said this new prophet went from Cufa into Syria, propagated his doctrines there, and finally disappeared, and was no more heard of.

Abulfeda, the Arab historian, on the authority of Ibn Saoud, says, "The Nusaireeh are called from Nusair, a companion of Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed."

Pocock cites another Arab historian, who says, "the Ansyreeh are an extreme sect of the Schiites. They declare that God appeared in the form of Ali, and spoke by his mouth the doctrine of Batin."

The Rev. Samuel Lyde, in his work "The Ansyreeh and Ishmaeleeh; A Visit to the Secret Sects of Northern Syria." Lon. 8vo. 1858, says:—

"Of the early history of the Ansyreeh, very little is known; but their physiognomy and religion prove them to be of a distinct origin from the other races inhabiting Syria. They are supposed to be of the north of Syria, and to have remained in the mountain chain stretching across Mount Cassius to the Lebanon, while successive titles of conquest have swept along the plains on either side. At no period have they acquired celebrity as a people or sect. . . . It is difficult to ascertain exactly all the details of the religion of the Ansyreeh, both because their religion is a secret and ill digested one, and because there are few or none amongst them at the present day who understand it so well as to have fixed points of agreement and disagreement. However, there is one thing in which they all seem to agree, and which acts as a kind of freemasonry in binding together the scattered members of their body, namely, secret prayers, which are taught to every male child of a certain age, at stated times, in stated places, and accompanied with religious rites. The known part of their religion is a mixture of Mohammedanism, Magianism, Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity."*

Their religion received its Mohammedan tinge or at least the present form of it, from a man of the name of Nusairee, who came into Syria from Irak, in the early times of Mohammedanism, when numerous sects arose, and that of the Assassins became the most celebrated.

Mr. Lyde says "The Ansyreeh regard Christ as a prophet, and keep Christmas as a great festival, but their principal doctrines are those of Mohammedans of the sect of Ali. They practise circumcision, and hold some opinions in common with the Israelites. They are tinctured also with Sabeanism. The two sects into which they are divided, are called Shemseeh and

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. iii., p. 282.

Kumreeh, names taken from the words which designate the sun and moon.

"They hold the doctrine of transmigration of souls, derived from the Paganism of Hindostan; and with the ancient Canaanites they build the tombs of their saints and prophets (their sheiks) on high places, and in groves, which become places of pilgrimage and worship."

At Antioch a considerable portion of the trade is in their hands, and being entirely subject to the bigoted Moslems of that city, they feign to be Orthodox Mussulmans, and fast and pray as such, though it is well known by the Turks that they are not true believers. They are far more numerous, Mr. Lyde states, than the Druses, though of less influence. There is much disunion amongst them as a sect, and of hostility to the creeds of each other, though each holds a secret religion, and all have many doctrines in common. They are prone to ridiculing each other's tenets, or books as they are designated. There are large numbers of them in Tripoli and Kamah, but the great bulk are in Latakia, and the mountainous districts to the east of it. They are found as high as Tarsus, in Asia Minor. In the Mountainous districts they are generally called Fellaheen, or peasants. They seldom call themselves Ansyreeh, that term being used as one of reproach by the Turks. They are governed by their own sheiks or chiefs, called Mekuddams. It must be acknowledged that the works of travellers which put forth the most specific claims to a knowledge of the secret rites and doctrines of the Ansyreeh, Druses, and Metouali, leave us in the same ignorance of them in which they found us. The Rev. Mr. Lyde's work is, unfortunately, no exception to the rule.

CHAPTER IX.

The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Druses.

THE origin of the Druses and the nature of their religion have long been themes of controversy, but rather subjects of speculation than research.

The writers who seem most favourable to this people in their views of the Druse character, are disposed to believe that their origin and religion have some christian elements in them, or that both present evidences of an admixture of paganism and Mohammedanism, purified or reformed in former ages to some extent; and consequently in their tendencies at the present time, that the Druses are more drawn towards Protestantism than any other sects in Syria, Christian or Mohammedan.

Other writers still more favourably disposed to the Druses, connect the origin of the Druses with the times and Christian warriors of the Crusades.

Men like Niehbur and Burckhart, who have travelled extensively in the East, thoroughly acquainted with the history of the people of the several countries they visited, afford the best information that can be obtained by inquiries on any subject analagous to the one in question.

"A man must carry knowledge with him (says Johnson), if he would bring home knowledge."

Those persons who have brought most knowledge to the assistance of the experience gained by travel, who seek for the truth irrespective of its bearings on the interest of their own

churches, or influences on their own national predilections, and have made this subject one of patient inquiry, will come to the conclusion that the Druses derive their origin from the Saracens, who settled in Syria during a term of 300 years ; that includes the existence of the power of the Caliphs from the period of the death of Mohammed, to the downfall of the last of his successors in the Caliphate; and that the Druses derive their religion from one of the earliest sects of Mohammedanism, the Karmatians, perpetrators of barbarous outrages and sanguinary atrocities, systematically effected, with one branch of which, the Ismalians, was connected the murderous tribe in Syria described by the early writers on the Crusaders as "Assasins."

The Druses of the present time ascribe their origin to the Saracens, who were followers of the sect of Ali, the founder of their faith, or one by whom it was settled into order, was a Caliph of Egypt called Hackheem or Hakim, who came on earth in the character of a Messiah. When the Messiah was assumed into the Deity, and was in heaven, a saintly person named Hamza was ordained by God to represent on earth the Lord Hakim, and to be the depository of the mysteries of his religion. This divine agent fled from Egypt into Syria, and took up his abode in the mountains of Lebanon. There he propagated the holy religion of Hakim with great success. He disappeared from earth, and another divine agent was sent forth named Moktaner, to carry on the work of Hamza. He was commissioned to preach the practical parts of religion contained in seven commandments, which enjoined on all true believers to observe truth, charity, renunciation of falsehood, confession of sins, submission to God's will. Steadfastness in the faith and proclamation of belief of this, being the only true and perfect religion.

The Druses occupy the whole of the southern range of the Lebanon chain, the western slope of Anti-Lebanon and G'bl-il-Sheikh, where they hold exclusive possession of upwards of forty towns and villages, and share two hundred with the

Maronites; while about eighty villages in other parts of Anti-Lebanon are peopled by them. Writers to whom their history is well known, assert that they owe their origin to a Persian, Mohammed Ben-Ismail-ed-Derazy, who settled in Egypt in 1017, and became such a fanatical disciple of that monster or madman, the Calif Hakem, that he was driven from the country and obliged to take refuge in the valley of Wady-el-Teim. Here he propagated his dogmas, which were afterwards modified by Hamza, whom the Druses venerate as their actual founder. This singular community have a dim, confused sort of belief in the unity of God and his manifestation of himself to men in the persons of seven individuals, the last of whom was Hakem, of infamous memory. They profess to believe in five spiritual angelic agencies. Their real tenets are not professed or revealed to any outside the circle of the initiated in their mysteries, of which their seems to be no doubt that idolatry enters into them, and that the secret worship of a calf forms one of their principal rites.

There is no evidence in the language, the physical aspect, or the manners and customs of the Druses, that they are of foreign extraction, or that they are even a distinct tribe. Their language is Arabic, without foreign idiom or accent; and their few peculiarities of dress and habits arise solely from the requirements of their faith.

According to their own traditions, the Druses believe that their ancestors originally dwelt upon that range of mountains situated between Laodicea and the extensive plains of the Amuk, and which are now exclusively inhabited by the fierce and little known Ansayrii tribes.

In 1811 the Druses were utterly expelled from this locality by the Ansayrii.

Upwards of fifteen hundred Druse families, the survivors of those who had been ruthlessly massacred, are said, upon this occasion, to have fled for protection and refuge to their fellow-religionists, dwelling on the Lebanon; and since that period it

is only in these parts exclusively that Druse settlements are to be encountered.

It fortunately happened for these refugees that some years previously there had been a considerable emigration of Druse families from the Lebanon, when nearly six hundred families migrated to the mountains of Houran, which border on the Syrian and Arabian deserts.

The towns held in peculiar estimation by the Druses of the Lebanon are the cities Ammatan and Bachlin. These are rallying points, where in time of warfare the tribes meet and swear allegiance to each other and their cause, in their places of worship. In these towns especially, the books of their faith are guarded religiously, and with jealous zeal. In Anti-Lebanon, Hasbeya and Rosheya answer the same purpose; and whenever anything is astir, anything going wrong, or any suspicion of danger is excited, from these places the news is telegraphed by bonfires throughout the Druse districts with extraordinary rapidity.

A singular custom prevails among the Druses. The higher order refuse to receive money or partake of food from the hands of strangers, lest such food or money should have come by improper means into the donor's hands. Consequently, when they have sums of money due to them for the produce of their vineyards, or for the sale of their silk crop, they employ a third party to change the money into other coin.

An astrologer, designated Sheik il N'goum, or the chief of the stars, usually accompanies the Druse sheik upon all visits of ceremony, or missions of importance, being invariably consulted upon all undertakings of moment.

The whole class admits of only two grand divisions, Akals, and D'ghahils, the former constituting that class that are supposed to be conversant with the Druse rites, the latter the common people.

Of the former division are the clergy and the learned doctors and elders; these superintend ordinances of worship,

and instruct the children in the elements of their religion. One distinguishing mark of this class is the extreme simplicity of their costumes, being forbidden to wear any article of gold or silk, whilst their language must be in accordance with their calling, profane or abusive language being strictly forbidden.

The Khalons or places of worship are usually situated apart from the villages, upon some commanding position. They take great care not to be disturbed or discovered by strangers while engaged in the secret duties of their religion.

In some of the larger and more important Khalons, the walls are decorated with the most grotesque specimens of rude art, highly coloured figures of men, women, children, birds, and beasts, wretchedly executed.

A law of divorce exists among them, but it is very seldom put into execution. If a wife leaves her husband's abode without an injunction to return again, this is tantamount to a divorce, and however willing both parties may be to re-unite, they cannot again be brought together, till the woman be first married again according to Turkish rites and ceremonials, to a third party, who must then divorce her, and after this she returns to her first husband.

The rite of circumcision is not practised by the Druses. But the most remarkable feature in the character of the Druse is, their appreciation of the rights and obligations of hospitality, which they look upon as being enjoined by their religion.

The Druses certainly inhabited Mount Lebanon, before the time of the first crusade, and were an independent and powerful tribe in the several periods of the Saracen, Frank, and Egyptian sway; and were never entirely subdued by any power, till about the year 1517.

About the year 1651 the members of the Shehaab family first began to assume the reigns of government among the Druses; and till the year 1841, with varying success, this family held sway in the Druse capital.

In 1668, Mohammed, Pacha of Constantinople was despatched with special instructions to the Lebanon, for the purpose of

effecting a better organization of the system of government; he established the seat of government at the favourite port of Sidon, which had then been famous as head-quarters for the crusading forces of the Franks.

In 1693 the Turkish Government waged war on the Druses, not with the sword, but with the nefarious policy that effects the same object as the weapon above named, by means of discord and disunion, the only sure method of weakening the strength of a strong tribe or faction.

In 1706 a young and inexperienced chieftain assumed the supreme command of the Druse tribes. As might have been expected, his youth and inexperience militated against his position, and the Turks were enabled by treachery and perfidy, to effect his ruin.

In the year 1741 the natives of Bekaa revolted against the Emir for having quartered a great number of troops upon them.

In 1748 the authority and power of the Lebanon Emir was augmented and confirmed by the Turkish authorities, who conferred upon him the government of Baalbec and the Bekaa.

In the year 1668 Daher, a powerful mountain sheik, carrying his independence further than it had ever been pushed by any of the Druse chieftains, obtained, by means of bribery and intimidation, the powerful position and titles of Sheik of Acre, Nazareth, Tiberias, Safat, and Galilee.

In 1788, Djezzar, Pachr, of infamous memory, named Shehaab, at that time a youth in the twenty fourth year of his age, Emir of the mountain, and supreme governor of the Lebanon. This prince was evidently a tool in the hands of Djezzar; who, with all his barbarity and cruelty, was a man possesed of considerable intellectual powers.

Djezzar being obliged, as was his annual custom, to accompany the Hadj for a certain distance on their pilgrimage, was compelled to leave the young Emir to sustain himself against formidable opponents; these opponents soon defeated him, but Djezzar, on his return from his pilgrimage, passed that way,

and took terrible vengeance on the enemies of his protegé. After an extensive massacre, he took effectual measures for completely subjugating the survivors, and broke down their independent church.

Maundrell, in 1697, visited the country of the Druses. In the third of an hour after his departure from Beyrout, he came to a plain extending about half a mile from the sea to the mountains. On the left hand was a small village, Sucfoat, belonging to the Druses, who possessd a tract of mountains as far as from Castravan to Carmel. Their present prince was an old man named Achmet, grand son to Faccardine, who kept up the prudent Druse custom of his ancestors of turning day into night. This practice was hereditary in his family, having learned from much sharp experience that Princes can never feel securely but by day, and cannot be too vigilant at night when people who are unawary and venture to sleep, may be made by a dagger or pistol, to sleep longer than was intended when they lay down.

"The Emir Faccardine, had his chief residence in this place. He was in the reign of Sultan Morat (Amurath), the fourth Emir or Prince of the Druses; a people supposed to have descended from some dispersed remainders of those Christian armies, that engaged in the crusades for the recovery of the Holy-Land; who afterwards being totally routed and despairing of a return to their native country again, betook themselves to the mountains hereabout: in which their descendants have continued ever since. Faccardine being (as I said) prince of these people, was not contented to be penned up in the mountains; but by his power and artifice, enlarged his dominions down into the plain all along the sea coast as far as from this place to Acre. At last the grand seignor growing jealous of such a growing power, drove the wild beast back again to the mountains from whence he had broke loose, and there his posterity retain their principality to this day."

Speaking of the inhabitants of the territories about Lebanon, Sandys says that, "they are of sundry nations and

religions, governed by a succession of princes, whom they call Emirs; descended, as they say from the Druses, the remainder of those French men which were brought into these parts by Godfrey of Bologne, who driven into the mountains above, and defending themselves by the advantages of the place, could never be utterly destroyed by the Saracens. At length they afforded them a peace and liberty of religion, conditionally that they wore the white turban, and paid such duties as the natural subject.

"But in tract of time they fell from the knowledge of Christ; and not thoroughly embracing the other, are indeed of neither. As for this Emir, he was never known to pray, nor ever seen in a mosque. His name is Faccardine; small of stature, but great in courage and achievement, about the age of forty, subtil as a fox, and not a little inclining to the tyrant. He never commenceth battle, nor executeth any notable design, without the consent of his mother."

The palace, as the abode of the Emir Bechir is called by Chasseaud, is thus described in his history of the Druses.

"Farchima is one of the most considerable villages situated on the Lebanon, comprising between three and four hundred houses and huts, of all sizes and description of architecture, and inhabited chiefly by Druses and Maronites. Very few of the habitations are mixed, the Druses who are the most numerous, occupying a distinct quarter of the village to that inhabited by the Maronites.

"We now proceed to enter the palace of the Emir, having first of all sent him word of our intention. Of the palace or its entrance gate, there is not much to be recorded; in any other large town of Syria, an ordinary caravansary might rival it in beauty of architecture and surpass it in strength; for this village, however, it is a prominent and remarkable edifice, fitted to be the habitation of a chief."

The Druses had attained the height of their power, when their

* Sandys travels in Turkey, Egypt, and the Holy Land in 1610., page 210.]

great captain and all his family were suddenly removed by the bowstring, after which the power of the Druse Emir was gradually reduced, till it became a mere shadow of what it had been.

In 1768, a Druse chief, named Daher, assumed the title of sheik of Acre, Nazareth, Tiberius, Safat, and Galilee, and routed all the Ottoman armies sent against him. In 1772, a revolution was effected in Egypt, many of the Druses were induced to join the Porte, and Sidon was besieged by the Turks and their new allies. Daher galloped to Acre, found there some Russian vessels of war, struck a bargain, and returned to wage a fierce contest with his foes. His Russian friends bombarded the Turkish towns; the Druses soon fell off from the Moslems, and Daher's star was once more in the ascendant. In 1775, Jaffa fell before the Egyptian troops, but the death of their commander stopped the progress of the victorious army. The Ottoman government still professed peace and friendship towards Daher, but suddenly bombarded Sidon with their fleet. The gallant chief, unprepared for this, was seeking present safety in flight, when he was shot dead by a peasant. Djezzar appointed the Emir Bechir Shehaab governor of the Lebanon, but it was long before the Druses would consent to acknowledge his authority, and not until their leader, Sheik Bechir Djonbelat, had been decapitated at Acre.

The Sheik Bechir was a Druse of extensive power at one time, greatly beloved by his people. The Emir, whose jurisdiction, when I first visited Syria in 1827, extended over all Mount Lebanon, was of a noble Turkish family from Mecca, a branch of which settled among the Druses, adopted their religion, which has continued from the time of the famous Fakardine to give rulers to Lebanon. The Emir, however, whether from policy or conviction, had turned Christian and had married one of his daughters to a converted Druse of the Maronite Catholic church. He affected however to fast the Ramazan in the presence of Turks, and like the Druses pretended to be a Mussul-

man when in Mohammedan society, and at a later period of his life adopted the religion of the Maronites.

Perhaps his chief motive for embracing Christianity was to attach to him the Christian population of the Lebanon who are more numerous than the Druses.

When the Emir Bechir was the Lord of the Lebanon previously to 1840 he could boast of his ability to bring thirty thousand Druses armed with muskets into the field. The Druse population was then estimated at two hundred thousand. The main industry of this people was silk weaving, and the number of looms at which they worked was very considerable, as many as twenty have been seen working in a single street of a Druse village.

The chief Druse districts in the Lebanon are Arkoub, Hoof, Shebba, Garb, Mattu, and the seat of their Emirs Dair el Kamr. They inhabit districts likewise in Haouran, Ante-Lebanon. In 1845, when Warburton published "The Crescent and the Cross," he estimated the total number of the Druses at 120,000 The Emir Bechir and his three sons were then in exile, and his power was in the hands o the Emir Saladin of Habeysha. It is a curious circumstance, that when Warburton's work was published all the Emirs or Princes of Lebanon, whether of the Christian, Maronite, or Osmanli Metouali, acknowledged the Emir Bechir as supreme and kissed his hands.

The Emir Bechir, however, in case of war, had not the power of summoning the dependents of the inferior Emirs to accompany him in battle; he had to apply to the inferior Sheiks of Mokaddems who seldom refused to furnish their contingent.

The Emir Bechir had the power of life and death, which now wisely is restricted to the Sultan.

Now all the Emirs of the mountains are nominally subject to the Pacha of Damascus. The Emir Bechir, it would appear from Warburton, was not the first Druse of his race who turned Christian to conciliate the Maronites. Some of his

Druse ancestors, it seems, had conformed to Christianity from like considerations. The Emir Bechir used to boast that he could bring 15,000 men into the field at a few hours' notice. In a short time after he made this boast, he was powerless, proscribed, and persecuted, in exile, and never destined to return to his country.

When Ibrahim Pacha met resistance at the hands of the inhabitants of the Lebanon, he demanded that the mountaineers should be disarmed. The Maronites complied; but the Druses resisted, and, notwithstanding the power and energy of their new masters, most of them retained their weapons. This gave them a great advantage over the Christians, which they have ever since maintained. The Egyptians were driven out by the English forces in 1840; and the aged Emir Bechir was deprived of his government and banished. A ruinous policy was now adopted for the government of Lebanon. It was divided into two sections; over the one was placed a Druse chief, and over the other a Christian, both being subject to the Pacha of Sidon. A fair field was thus opened for giving full scope to jealousies, bitter hatred, and smothered feuds of centuries. Each sect, under its own leader, watched a favourable opportunity to assail the other. The Turkish Pacha, feeling his inability to control the warlike mountaineers, stirred up their mutual jealousies, and in the wars of 1841 and 1845 succeeded in desolating a great part of Lebanon by fire and sword. When both Maronites and Druses were sufficiently weakened, the Turks tried to disarm them; but this, so far as the Druses were concerned was a failure. In one thing, however, the Turks did not fail. They did not fail in destroying the roads constructed by the old Emir; in ruining his beautiful palaces; in effectually checking that agricultural industry and commercial enterprise which he had originated, and which the Egyptians fostered; in handing over life and property throughout the whole mountain to the tender mercies of every armed vagabond; and in kindling such deadly hatred in the breasts of the rival sects as must eventually make the Lebanon a wilderness.

"*It is greatly to be regretted that this plan of divided rule was adopted chiefly through the influence of England. No plan could be more fatal to the prosperity of the mountains, or the peace of its inhabitants. And so long as it is persisted in, war and bloodshed must continue.*"

This opinion, be it observed, is expressed by an author of eminence in a late article on the Syrian Massacre in one of our principal Quarterly Reviews.

Chasseaud, in his History of the Druses, makes the following observations on the Egyptian occupation of Syria, and the part taken by the Druses in relation to it:—"All the intermittent forays, expeditions and invasions undertaken from time to time against the Druses by the Turkish troops, have been made in vain; they have produced no durable results. Their effects have never been more than temporary and transient; and wonderful is the recuperative energy of the Druse mountaineers. Nor was the best of Egyptian Generals, Ibrahim Pacha, more successful in his attempts to subdue the Druses, during his famous Syrian campaigns. With all the prestige of his great success and powerful name—with all his daring and skill, and the formidable numbers of trained Egyptian soldiers under his command, he was unable to reduce the Druse mountains to subjection. The proud spirit of too bold a people opposed his every effort. Deeply imbued with the heroic traditions of their ancestors, and loving their freedom as they loved the breeze of their own mountains, the Druses met all his assaults with noble courage; they clung to their native heights with the most desperate tenacity, and even when temporarily overpowered, they seemed to bend before the greater strength brought to bear upon them, the fire of their resistance only smouldered, to burst forth again with renewed ardour on the first opportunity. Notwithstaning Ibrahim Pasha's conquest of every part of Syria, it is notorious that the Druses, although overcome for a time, remained virtually unvanquished. They never endured the thraldom which the son of Mohammed Ali so fiercely imposed upon neighbouring races. Indeed that

dreaded Egyptian Prince gave proof of more diplomatic expediency and pliability of temper in their regard, than was his custom to exhibit towards others; for he shewed an unusual readiness to adapt himself as much as possible to the peculiarities of the mountain chieftains.

In short, Ibrahim Pacha never was in a position to declare himself conqueror of the Druse tribes.

"A remarkable incident, however, in which the Druses were concerned, occurred at the time of his evacuation of Syria, and it will always remain to the indelible discredit of a man, who, in other respects was a brave soldier. The circumstance which I am about to mention, evinced on the part of Ibrahim Pacha, an unscrupulous, cruel, and pitiless despotism. At the period when Sir Charles Napier was in possession of the seaport towns of Beyrout and Sidon, he communicated with the Druse chief, at that time the Christian Emir Bechir, and demanded the help of the mountain tribes to aid the British arms against the Egyptian usurper. This summons of Sir Charles Napier came to the knowledge of Ibrahim Pacha, and he instantly sent a short, fierce message to the Emir, and to all the chiefs connected with the Lebanon, declaring that if one single man amongst them should make the slightest attempt to aid the English in resistance of Egyptian authority, such a step would be tantamount to signing the death warrant of every Druse in his power, for all of them should be immediately put to death. Now, at that very moment the sons and nephews of the Emir Bechir himself were actually serving under the Egyptian general, and were, of course, at his mercy."*

In 1834 the Emir Bechir had been incited by the English consular authorities to get his Druses to go to war with Ibrahim Pacha, and to join the insurrection that had been got up in the Lebanon against Ibrahim Pacha, and his Egyptian forces.

The old Emir Bechir, in his 77th year, was induced to sur-

* Chasseaud's History of the Druses of the Lebanon.

render himself into the hands of the Turkish government in 1841, by the English authorities in the Levant.

This act, exceedingly impolitic as well as unjust, has not been forgotten, and never will be forgiven in Syria. MacFarlane has given an interesting account of an interview with the old Emir, "the most venerable man he ever saw," then in his 83rd year, at Brusa, the place of banishment assigned to him.

The Emir stated to MacFarlane that the English Consul-general of ———, and another British consul in Syria, had been the cause of his ruin; they had betrayed him. "He maintained that he never had been in rebellion against the Sultan; that the Porte had driven him into perilous enterprizes, and then abandoned him to those whose enmity he had provoked by their command. That in the year 1834, they had excited him and his subjects, the Druses, to join in the insurrection against Mohammed Ali, the Pacha of Egypt, and that on that luckless occasion, being left without the support the Turks had promised him, he had been defeated by Ibrahim Pacha and compelled to submit to the Egyptian rule; that in 1840, when the four great powers of England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, resolved that the whole of Syria and Palestine should be restored by force of arms to the young Sultan, he had been visited by English as well as by Turkish agents, and by them impelled to rise up against the Egyptians."

Accordingly he and the Druses joined in the movement against the Egyptians. That movement failed, and they were compelled to submit to the Egyptian rule, because they could no longer resist Ibrahim Pacha.

When the Egyptians were driven out of Syria, the old Emir was induced to seek refuge on board an English vessel of war. He was taken to Malta, remained there eleven months, and was well and hospitably treated. At the end of that time, the Emir was informed by the English authorities, he must go to Constantinople, and confide in the magnanimity and mercy of the Sultan. He went, depending, however, wholly on the protection of the British minister, and, as he states, he received no

protection from him or his representatives there. The Turkish Government sent orders to him to quit the capital with all his family (including several sons) and retinue, and proceed to a town in the vicinity of Erzeroum, in Asia Minor.

The old Emir demurred in vain; he was told by some officials that if he did not obey the orders given him, "they would drag him away by his white beard." After long sufferings in the place of exile he was first sent to, he was removed to Brusa, and an allowance given to him of 10,000 piastres a month, which up to the time of MacFarlane's visit (1847) had been regularly paid.

Speaking of his misfortunes to MacFarlane, he said, "I was a free man in my mountains, surrounded by my faithful and brave people, and none would have brought me from them by force: neither English, nor Austrians, nor Turks, nor Egyptians would have dared to march into my country. I was deceived, cajoled, and entrapped by English agents! I went voluntarily down to the coast and on board an English man-of-war, and then I found that I was a prisoner!"

The old man made some melancholy allusions to his ruined fortunes, and those of his people. He said, "Well the Turks have had their way. I and all my family are their captives; but what have they gained by it? They have turned my pleasant palace into a barrack, they have stabled their horses in my kiosks, they have destroyed everything and carried off all that was mine. But can they call Mount Lebanon their own? Has the country been quiet a single day since they bore me from it?"*

MacFarlane cannot understand what business England had in interfering, or interest it had in overthrowing, the dynasty of the Emir Bechir, "which had existed from the time of the crusades, and had ruled in mount Lebanon before Osman laid the foundation of the Ottoman Empire at Brusa.

At these interviews of Mac Farlane, with the old Emir Bechir,

* Turkey and its Destiny. vol, 2, p. 69.

the prince of the Druses of the Lebanon, he always observed there was present an aged clergyman, "an orthodox Roman Catholic Priest," who had lived in Italy, spoke Italian perfectly, and French tolerably well. The priest belonged to the Emir's household, and evidently exercised considerable influence over the Emir, and must have lived a long time with him to be so well informed on subjects relating to the Lebanon and the Druses, as he appeared to be in the conversation between Mac Farlane and the Emir, in which he joined. MacFarlane obobserves—"There seemed to be a curious intermixture of religions. The Padre was strictly an orthodox Roman Catholic Priest. The Emir, who in the Lebanon, had ruled over Christians as well as Druses, was said to be half Druse, half Christian; and of his people now with him, some were a sort of Christians, some were Mussulmans, and some strict Druses. I had no opportunity of making inquiries about this last mysterious sect, its tenets and its rites. I only remembered that the Emir's grandson told me that the Druses worshipped the image of a calf which was always enclosed in an ark."

Lord Lindsay, in his excellent "Letters on Egypt, Edom and the Holy Land," in 1836 and 1837, vol. 11, p. 131, gives an account of the Druses he met with in some of the villages of Gebel Nauran. Many of the towns, he says, exclusively inhabited by Druses kindred to those of Lebanon, they appeared to him the most superior race in the country. Their Sheiks and aged people, were always well dressed; their women neatness itself in their attire, with their white veils pendent from a silver horn projecting from the forehead, reminding one of the Coiffure en pain de Sacre of the 14th and 15th century in France and England, the same fashion of a head gear that we read of in the scriptures in Edom and the Holy Land 4,000 years ago. Lord Lindsay says this silver horn on the head is still the principal ornament of the fair sex christians, as well as Druses in Mount Lebanon. I think his Lordship is mistaken with respect to the use of the silver horn by the Christian women of Lebanon.

The capital of the Druses in the Haouran is Sueda.

The principal Druse villages on the Lebanon are Moushmoushi, Baiteer, Aumatour, Muktara, Halouét, Deiril-Kamar, Bêt-il-Deen, Backleen, K'flnebra, Ain Anoob, Aitat, Shouafat, B'humdoon, Arayiah, K'farchima, and Mansourie, lying between Sidon and Beyrout, where the Druses are far more numerous. To the north-east of Beyrout are Brummana, Corneille, Mittaine, Shouaer, Boukfaia, and Solima, and the village of Souyre, in the Anti-Lebanus, which is exclusively inhabited by Druses.

The mountain called Gebel El Sheik is supposed to be the highest mountain in these parts, its summit being perpetually covered with snow.

Under the sway of the Druse Emir at Rashia, is another unimportant Druse village, an hour and a half distant from one of more consideration called Haimte. The most striking feature of this latter village is the fact that its Druse inhabitants appear strictly to adhere to the tenets of the Mohammedan law, being scrupulous in their attendance to rites and ceremonials, and governed by a Turkish Dervish conjointly with their own peculiar sheik.

About an hour distant from Haimte, situated to the left of a beacon track, are Denibi and Mimis; whilst further on and to the right is Seffa; all three Druse villages.

Three hours further, and in a direct course south, we pass Ain Ephjer; and after riding two hours over a desolate country we reach the village of Hasbeia, situated on the top of a mountain.

Hasbeia contains nearly eight hundred houses, it is the residence, at some seasons of the year, of the Greek patriarch of Damascus; and is governed by a Druse Emir, subject to the authority of the Pasha of Damascus. Its inhabitants are of mixed creeds, but by far the greater proportion are Druses.

"After Hasbeia, and close to the village of Banias, which is dependent upon it, is the village Medjal, situated on the summit of a mountain of considerable elevation, and inhabited

principally by Druses, the proportion of Christian families being only as one to a hundred.

The Druses of this village, in common with most of those inhabiting the country about the neighbourhood of Damascus, pretend to be disciples of the Mohametan faith, strictly observing the Ramazan fast. Some of these very people have been known even to profess Christianity so far as to employ the services of a Latin Monk, whilst at the same time, on every occasion of their visiting Damascus, they attended the Mosques there publicly.

At Latakia, the Hon. Mr. Walpole says, the following statement was given to him respecting some religious rites of the Druses. No authority is given for this statement; I do not therefore attach much value to it, but as Mr. Walpole thought it worth while to give insertion to it in a work of no small merit, I refer to it: "The other day at dinner the following story was related:—A Christian peasant being anxious to witness the worship of the Druses, laid himself in a window-hole, whence he could not be seen. Presently the Druses assembled, and sitting down, recited several prayers; then they produced a figure. One said, "You are God who made the world; who made so and so, who did so and so. You let the Druses be beaten and gave them up to the Turks. Now, save yourself." And the figure was handed over to others who soundly flogged it. Another was produced, "You are the Saviour, the Son of God. You have brought more trouble, wars, fights, on the earth than aught else. Save yourself." And this idol was handed over, and treated like the first. Another was produced, "You are Mahomet, and what have you done? We owe you wars, fightings—our tyrants, our persecutors. Hand him over." And he was whipped. Another was produced, "You are Providence. Now see what you can do. Save yourself."

A very important and authentic original Arabic document—

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. iii, p. 90.

an account of, or rather interpretation of the sacred writings in which the mysteries and doctrines of the Druses are contained —was procured by Mr. G. W. Chasseaud, a native of Beyrout, in Syria, in 1851, in a village of the Lebanon named Hadded. A translation of this document is given by Mr. Chasseand, in a very interesting work of his, entitled "The Druses of Lebanon," published in 1855. Of Mr. Chasseaud's trustworthiness and knowledge of the Arabic language, no doubt can be entertained. He is a member of a highly respectable family, with some of whom I was acquainted in Syria many years ago.

The document above referred to, is divided into eighteen chapters, and occupies thirty-two pages. The doctrines therein illustrated are unquestionably those of many of the Sheoniite sects of Mohammedanism, whose disciples uphold the sanctity and superior spiritual excellence of Ali, as of a far higher order than those of Mohammed; and, what is particularly remarkable, who connect the names and acts of the seven orthodox Imaams, the 6th of whom was Ishmael Ebn Jaffar, with the present rites and priests of the Druses.

In the first chapter entitled, "A short explanation of the ocean of Time," there is a luminous account *(lucus a non lucendi)* of the creation of the world and all things in it.

The second chapter informs us, "The souls that have been created in the world (that is of all mankind), were numbered from the beginning, and have never diminished or increased, and will remain so for all eternity."

Again in the same chapter, "The bodies of these souls are all corruptible, but the souls themselves are incorruptible and unchangeable, shifting from one man or beast to another, and never differing from what they were and continue to be."

The third chapter gives an account of creative energies, the labors of seven original spirits deriving aid from the creator, and giving their aid to Chaor, whereby the seven planets were organised. "These seven planets amongst the interior economy of the earth, and all that happens to the animal or vegetable and mineral creation, is through the agency

of these seven stars, or *planets:* fortune and misfortune are ruled by them."

Chapter 4th tells us "The Amighty creator had compassion on the *people*, and granted them those specific orders.

And those specific orders are the borders, or order of truth and the order of falsehood."

Chapter 5th says, "The division of the righteous people was predestined from that very beginning to happiness and good.

The division of those who are born to perdition, was predestined to disobedience from the beginning to the very last day."

The 6th chapter tells us "This Pronouncer of invitation," was wont to declare himself a prophet, and one based upon a solid foundation. He was also wont to rise upon the people with a sword, and with compulsion, in order to force them to embrace his law.

After the death of this eloquent one, his creed was propagated on the confines of Truth, in order to explain the meaning of the descent from heaven.

And this eloquent one established himself, an inward or secret law,—and was possessed of sufficient knowledge of the true law to base his own creed thereon.

After the passing away of the supporter of this *eloquent one*, the seven priests arose and embraced his law."

In the same chapter we are informed, "Then appeared the creator in uncovering the glory and shame of the Amr, and established the all powerful Ali, to reveal his Unity and the extent of his power, to establish prayer, to separate knowledge, to give laws, to establish decrees, and to refer to the promises and the promised."

Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, are a tissue of verbose absurdities.

Chapter 12th tells us "Now, when Jesus, the son of Joseph, appeared with the New Testament, and established himself as the Lord, the Messiah, who is Jesus, (the peace of God be upon him!) he was accompanied by his four apostles, John, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, (the peace of God upon them!) and

the people of truth profited by his revelations, although they pretended to the truth, in the law, and copied the law of Moses in explaining the law of Jesus."

Again in the same chapter, "After this Mohammed, the son of Abdalla, appeared with his law, which is the law of Islam.

And Mohammed established Ebn Abou Taleb, as his supporter, and all the disciples of truth followed the law of Islam, as they had done every other law that had preceded it."

And in the same chapter, "The time of Mohammed Ebn Abdalla, was more evident and more demonstrative of power than all the epochs that preceded him; consequently, they pretended for singleness in Ebn Abou Taleb, moreover because the prophets Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, foretold the appearance of a man, the highest of the high, whose rank is great, whose name be glorified!

This was Ali Ebn Abou Taleb.

When the term of the priesthood of Mohamed Ebn Abdalla, was completed, Mohamed Ebn Ismail, the prophet, appeared, whose law is the final of all laws inciting to the right path; and he is from the seed of Ali Ebn Taleb.

And to Mohamed Ebn Ismail there is a supporter secretly established in Paradise, and no one knows his name, because he does not appear in the manifestation of the law which we have."

Chapter 13th informs us "When Mohamed Ebn Ismail appeared, and introduced his law, the disciples of Truth believed in his law and his prophecies, and they recognised his excellence and his supporter, who was Sayeed il Muhdi Ebn Ahmed.

And it is through Mohamed ebn Ismail and his supporter, that are made perfect the perfect in eloquence, the holy men, and the priesthood.

Then the power of Mohamed passed to his descendants, who are the priests the respected, until it reached Sayeed il Muhdi, and from Sayeed il Muhdi, it passed to others in seclusion, and ultimately appeared openly, in the kingdom, and in the government, through Kaem, Mansoor, Maaz, Azeez, and Hakem, the

eternal, the assisted, the cherished, the beloved, and the governor."

Chapter 14th tells us "in the preaching of the Lord the Messiah, no manifestation takes place; for Jesus said unto the people, "My time is not consummated; after me will appear a director who is prevented from coming at this time."

And the creator, may he be praised! manifested himself corporeally, in the time of the fourth Heaven, in Abdalla Ebn Abmed, under the name of Ali; he is the exalted over all exalted, unto whom belongeth the right of command.

He also manifested himself corporeally in the time of the fifth Heaven, which is Mohamed Ebn Abdalla, under the name of Maal.

The appearing of Maal (may he be honoured and glorified!) was in the country of Tadmor to the East, and his appearance was extremely beautiful and glorious, and he was most rich, and travelled alone with one thousand camels laden with goods and merchandise.

The duration of Maal the exalted, lasted until the time of the fifth priest was completed, who is Mohammed, the aforesaid.

After him appeared his son Hussein, who is the sixth Heaven, and after Hussein, his son Abdalla il Muhdi, who is called Ebn Ahmed, but who should be called Muhdi, and after him Sayeed il Muhdi, who is the seventh from among the prophets.

The creator again manifested himself under the name of Kaem, as an infant, and in appearance as the son of Maal."

The 16th chapter informs us "At the close of the time of the Almighty Kaem, the creator most praised, manifested himself bodily and in the priesthood of Mansoor, and it was apparently visible that he was son of Il Kaem, and that Il Kaem had transferred upon him the priesthood, and had clothed him with the Cailifat, and assigned his power to him.

And the faith of Mansoor was promulgated all over the earth, and made known to all assemblies, and Mansoor performed miracles, and changed some of the articles of the law, as the

Almighty Kaem had also done before him, and his priesthood took place in the county of the West."

The 18th chapter tells us "Then the Almighty withdrew himself, and then appeared upon earth an evil spirit, and this evil spirit remained on earth seven years, and his limits were from Antioch to Alexandria.

And the companies of this evil spirit were tempting the Unitarians, of whom they gained a great number, both men, women, and children."

Again in the same chapter, "Then appeared my Lord Bohaddeen, and he was possessed of "the order of Truth"; and Moktanna Bohaddeen was the last that appeared, after him no laws remained uncompleted; he fulfilled the creation, and completed the conversion of the people, and delivered the rest of the Unitarians."

In the same chapter we are told, "And when Moktanna disappeared, he published his noble epistle, with the epistles of Il Kaem, and the epistles of Hamza, the wisdom of Unitarianism, which epistles shewed that these noble persons appeared personally, and set down a law, which law teaches us to know the laws, the beginning, the end, the promise, the threat, the reward, the punishment, the past and future,"

Abstract of what it is necessary for a Unitarian to know, believe and observe, taken briefly from the book of the law. "It is necessary that the Unitarian should possess the knowledge of four things:—

1.—The knowledge of our Lord God (may his name be exalted!).

2.—The knowledge of Il Kaem.

3.—The knowledge of the Prophets.

4.—The knowledge of those virtues which it is necessary to observe."

It is also necessary to believe in God in his human form, without asking questions of—Where? or how much? or who? that the same figure of the deity has no flesh, no blood, nor body, nor weight.

It is necessary the Unitarians should believe in God represented by the ten directors—Ali, El Bar, Zacharias, Elias, Maal, El Kaem, Mansoor, Maaz, Azees, and Hakem.

The highest Director was all his time invisible, and there was no priesthood with him. El Bar was also invisible in the priesthood.

After El Bar, appeared Adam El Gerone, who is Enoch.

After him appeared seven priests from "The order of Truth," who followed his steps; and after them appeared the givers of laws, Noah, Abinham, Moses, Jesus, Mohamed, Mohamed the 2nd and Said El Mokti, and these were all one soul. Then the priesthood reached its rightful owner, Kaem Hamza Ebn Ali.

It is necessary to possess the knowledge of the seven laws, viz:—The truth of the Tongue or belief in the divinity of El Hakem, in the priesthood of Kaem (Hamza), in the true prophets, priests, and leaders, the true religion. Also in the Transmigration of souls from one body to another, in the resurrection of the dead, and in future rewards and punishments.

Secondly—The knowledge of the preservation of friendship between brothers—which means to recognise their ranks, to love them whether far or near, to be humble before superiors, to treat well those who are low in rank amongst us, to support them both. Secretly and publicly to give them their due rights temporal or spiritual, and to regard them as friends.

Thirdly—*The abandonment of the doctrine of idols, being the abandonment of the doctrine of those who believe in the Tanzeel* (the Koran), and those who believe in the traditions, and who make Ali Ebn Abou Taleb like unto God, and say that God is not one.

Fourthly—The knowledge of the abandonment of evil spirits, which means disbelief in devils and deceivers, and those who belong to the order of deceivers.

Fifthly—The knowledge of the worship of one God; which signifies belief in God's sole essence, being invisible, without substance, weight, or form.

Sixthly—The knowledge of being satisfied with the acts of God, implying resignation to his laws.

Seventhly—The knowledge of submission to his will; implying obedience, patience, dutifulness.

And these are the Seven Laws which belong to the Unity: and "The truth of the tongue" is instead of prayer; and "The perseverance of friendship between brothers" is instead of giving alms; and "The abandonment of the worship of idols" is instead of fasting; and "The disbelief in evil spirits" is instead of the "Proofs;" and "The acknowledgment of Our Lord" is instead of the "Two Proofs;" and "To be satisfied with his acts" is instead of warfare; and "The resignation to his will" is instead of authority.

The conclusion is—that whosoever knows and believes in what has preceded, and is sound of mind and body, and of full age, and free from servitude, will be of those who are destined to the privileged ranks, and entitled to be present at the private assemblies, at which whosoever is present will be saved by Almighty God, and whosoever is absent will repent. May God facilitate his ways of good, and pour upon us his blessing! He is the Assistant, the Giver of Victory, the Wise and the Experienced! Amen." *

Such is the religion of the Druses, of which the preceding account is, in all probability, the most reliable that exists. On its own showing it is a confused disjointed mass of Paganism, heterodox Mohammedanism, and corrupted Christianity.

The total Druse population may exceed 80,000 souls; some say 100,000. Of these, some 70,000 are concentrated in the southern division of Mount Lebanon, and round the base of Hermon. In Haurân, the ancient Bashan, there are 7,000 or 8,000; and in Jabel el-Ala a few hundred families still remain.

I have elsewhere had to notice a very remarkable leading article in the "Times," on the Syrian Massacres, beginning with the enquiry,—"What are we to do with the Druses?"

The well-informed writer of that article tells his readers truly:—

* Chasseaud's "Druses of the Lebanon."

"The great Druse Chief, Mohamed-el-Nasar, the instigator of the recent butcheries, proclaims openly his contempt of the Sultan, and defies retaliation. This man is a curious specimen of a savage, with just a smack of European ideas, and just enough knowledge of European politics to set him on a wrong tack, and add to his brutality the inspiration of conceit. He sets up as something of a gentleman, and cultivates English acquaintance, so far as a fortress in the mountain enables him to do so. His fortress itself has pretensions to being a palace, and exhibits corridors and galleries, marbles and gilding. He has entertained English travellers quite lately in this embellished chateau, and he does us the honour to have a mighty respect for us. But there is something irreclaimable about this savage; he gets a smattering of the talk of European life, and scrapes up a few facts about governments and the politics of different states, but they are not incorporated in his mind, and never once mingle with his real vein of intellect, which is entirely savage, exhibiting the cunning which can unthread the windings of tribe or clan politics tolerably well, contrive a combination of mountain heads, and scheme an onslaught, but is utterly incapable of grasping a single fact out of its own accustomed sphere. The civilisation of these men is only skin deep, and what they know about us, their European stock of ideas, stick like so much plaster upon the wild aboriginal intellect, with which it refuses to amalgamate, and of which it is only an unsightly, discordant outside decoration. . . . . The only use to which, it seems, Mohammed has turned his knowledge of the civilized world, is to start the idea that a massacre of the Maronites would be extremely grateful to England, as being a blow to French interests in Syria. That is just the sort of truth which a barbarian acquires from a smattering of Western life and politics. He only sees things really in the light in which his savage nature reveals them, and his knowledge immediately joins the barbaric material within, is enlisted in its service, and aids in its forcible development. This man, it appears, really fancied himself an

European politician, and thought that he had the head of a cabinet statesman on his shoulders in planning this desperate and horrible scheme of Christian massacre. He counted on English support, and therefore, it need not be added, on an English reward. He had, doubtless, before him the vision of an expanded and exalted tribe—of an alliance of England and the Druses, which would bring the latter out of their barren fastnesses, and introduce them to the luxury and capital of the world; and, finally, of himself mounting upon his tribe's success, and becoming a great man and head of the English party in Syria."

But the writer of the "Times" has not told us who the parties are who have put these things into the heads of the Druse chiefs? Who are the Europeans who have put these false ideas into the minds of the great Druse chief Mohamed-en-Nasar and his compeers, the instigators of those butcheries of Roman Catholic Christians, "that a massacre of Maronites would be extremely grateful to England, as being a blow to French interests in Syria?"

My answer to these enquiries is—the persons who are answerable, to a very considerable extent, for these atrocities are those exceedingly indiscreet persons connected with our Bible Societies and Consular Agencies in Syria, of whose imprudent, unauthorised, and, if it were not for their mischievous, I would say, bombastic and ridiculous correspondence and personal communications with these sanguinary, idolatrous barbarian chiefs. Of the amicable relations of those persons with the Druses, and the assurances given by them of the deep interest taken in England in all that concerns their welfare, and of the respect in which their noble character and their valour is held there, we have many samples in the late Parliamentary Papers on the Syrian Disturbances.

It really is time to put an end to this scandalous abuse of missionary influence and consular power in Syria—to keep British imperial interests wholly separate and apart from these miserable contests and controversies, which lead to terrible

calamities and the effusion of so much Christian blood. Till this is done, the influence and power exercised by our Ambassador at the Porte will be misconceived, misrepresented, and misconstrued by the representatives of other European sovereigns. This has been the case already with regard to our interference with the Porte in behalf of one of those instigators of the late massacres.

The Druse Chief Seyd Bey, or Said Bey Hyemblat, was one of those pet anti-Christian barbarians, the result of whose intercourse with our countrymen is so graphically described in "The Times" article I have just referred to.

In a letter published in the London papers, and commented on freely in some French journals, dated from Constantinople, 23rd March, 1861, we read: "At the instance of Sir H. Bulwer, the Porte has consented not to execute the Druse chief Seyd Bey Hyemblat. No decision has as yet been given on the demand of the majority of the International Commissioners for the execution of Koorschid and Tahir Pachas. The execution is, however, not likely to take place."

The most powerful of the Druse chiefs in Lebanon were the following: Sheik Said Hyemblat, called, from his great wealth, the "Purse of the Druses." He held an influential post under the Turkish Government, as Head of Police in the district of Mukhtarah. He appears to have played an atrocious part in the late outbreak—openly professing a desire for peace, but secretly stirring up his men to wholesale murder. He was brought to trial by Fuad Pacha, convicted, and sentenced to death; but, by the indefatigable exertions of Lord Dufferin, the British Commissioner, this chief, and all the other convicted Druse chiefs, have had their sentences commuted, or been liberated.

CHAPTER X.

The Metoualis.

THE METOUALIS of the Lebanon are heterodox Mohammedans, of a very loose character in faith and morals. They call themselves orthodox Osmanlis, but they are of the Schiite sect of Ali. Wild, uncivilised people, they are the least numerous of the inhabitants of the Lebanon. Their numbers now hardly exceed 20,000. They inhabit Askalon, Sidon, Baalbec, and the mountainous district of Diebet.

Lieutenant Burton, in his "Travels in the Hedjaz, or a Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina," conjectures that the Metoualis of Syria are identical with a race of Arabs—the Nahhawilah people—of permanent bad fame in their locality, who dwell in Mecca, separate from the other inhabitants. These people are of a sect, or rather a branch, in particular bad odour, of Schiites, followers and venerators of Ali. They hold the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and are reproached with holding opinions and principles remarkable for their perversity, such as community of women. They curse the Sonnites and their venerated Caliphs, and have their own priests and teachers, resembling strikingly, in many particulars, the Metoualis, according to Burton; but, as I think, still more the Druses.

Dr. Thompson, a Protestant missionary, long and intimately

acquainted with the Metoualis (whom he designates Metâwelis), thus speaks of this community:—

"This people are fearfully profane. Everybody curses and swears when in a passion. No people that I have ever known can compare with these Orientals for profaneness in the use of the names and attributes of God. The evil habit seems inveterate and universal. When Peter, therefore, began to curse and to swear on that dismal night of temptation, we are not to suppose that it was something foreign to his former habits. He merely relapsed, under high excitement, into what, as a sailor and a fisherman, he had been accustomed to all his life. The people now use the very same sort of oaths that are mentioned and condemned by our Lord. They swear by the head, by their life, by heaven, and by the temple, or, what is in its place, the church. The forms of cursing and swearing, however, are almost infinite, and fall on the pained ear all day long.

"If the laws of Moses concerning things and persons unclean were intended to keep the Jews from mingling with the surrounding nations, nothing more effectual could have been devised for this purpose. I know by experience that it even renders it very unpleasant to reside in a Metâwely village, and is an effectual barrier against forming any intimate relations with them. You never contract friendships with persons who will neither eat, drink with, nor visit you, and into whose houses you cannot enter without contracting or imparting defilement. The law must be broken down before people thus situated can either unite in religious ceremonies or contract family alliances. These Metawelies do thus live separated, both in fact and feeling, from their neighbours, hating all, hated by all. Of course, they refuse to eat with all classes except themselves; and so it was with the Jews."

Dr. Thompson goes on to point out striking resemblances in their customs, prejudices, some of their rites, and in the contour and expression of their features, with those of the Jews.

"Their rules," he says, "are exactly the same as those

found in the eleventh chapter of Leviticus, even to the breaking of earthen vessels which have become defiled." The law which obliged persons afflicted with loathsome diseases to dwell without the camp is still in force, not merely among tent-dwelling Arabs, but also with the people. We spent the hot summer months of 1852 in a village above Sidon. The inhabitants were nearly all Metawelies, and very fanatical. On a rocky hill to the south, a poor woman (labouring under an infectious disease) was thus separated, living in a booth formed of green bushes. She was not allowed to leave her solitary shelter, and no one was permitted to visit her but the person who carried her daily food. There she passed her wretched days and nights, until death delivered her from the dismal solitude."

The women, according to Dr. Thompson, are "a sallow, forlorn, and ill-conditioned generation, every way inferior to the Christian women who dwell by their side."

"From whom," asks Dr. Thompson, "did they derive this law?

"It is impossible to ascertain. In its details it so closely resembles the Mosaic precepts concerning ceremonial defilements, as to suggest the idea that they have borrowed it from the Jews. . . . . The general mass of the Moslems are the mingled descendants of the various races who composed the population of the Greek empire at the time of Mohammed; and this original confusion of races has been infinitely augmented during the twelve centuries of their lawless occupation. In all the Christian sects there has been the same blending of primitive races, and a large infusion of foreign and European blood during the times of the Crusades, and subsequently, even to our day; so that the most intelligent and learned admit that it is absolutely impossible now to ascertain their true national origin. The Maronites, as a body, may have descended from the ancient Syrians. The Nusarîyeh suggest the idea that they are the miserable *debris* of the accursed Canaanites. The Metâwelies appear to have immigrated from Persia,—they

have a decided resemblance to the Jews. The Moslems of Palestine, and particularly from Carmel southward, have largely intermingled with the Egyptians. Perhaps some of their peculiarities of manners, countenance, and language, may have been derived from the old Philistines, who came originally from Egypt, as I believe, and not from Cappadocia or Cyprus. In the inhabitants of Lebanon and the plains at its base we may possibly find some traces of the ancient Phœnician." *

Volney has given us a better account of the Metoualis than any other writer, though a period of three-quarters of a century has transpired since his work on Egypt and Syria was published.

"To the east of the country of the Druses, in the deep valley which separates their mountains from those of Damascus, we find another small nation, known in Syria by the name of Metoualis. The characteristic distinction between them and the other inhabitants of Syria, is that they, like the Persians, are of the sect of Ali, while all the Turks follow that of Omar or Moaouia. This distinction, occasioned by the schism which, in the thirty-sixth year of the Hegira, arose among the Arabs respecting the successors of Mahomet, is the cause, as I have already observed, of an irreconcilable hatred between the two parties. The sectaries of Omar, who consider themselves as the only orthodox, assume the title of Sonnites, which has that signification, and term their adversaries Shiites, that is Sectaries, of Ali. The word Metouali has the same meaning in the dialect of Syria. The followers of Ali, dissatisfied with this name, substitute that of Adlia, which means Asserters of Justice—literally, Justiciarians—a denomination which they have assumed in consequence of a doctrinal point they advance in opposition to the Sonnite faith. A small Arab treatise, entitled, 'Theological Fragments concerning the Sects and Religions of the World,' has the following passage:—

* "The Land and The Book," by Dr. Thompson, p. 165.

"'Those sectaries who pretend that God acts only on principles of justice conformable to human reason, are called Adlia, or Justiciarians. God cannot, say they, command an impracticable worship, nor ordain impossible actions, nor enjoin men to perform what is beyond their ability; but wherever he requires obedience, will bestow the power to obey. He removes the cause of evil, he allows us to reason, and imposes only what is easy, not what is difficult; he makes no man responsible for the actions of another, nor punishes him for that in which he has no part; he imputes not as a crime what himself has created in man; nor does he require him to avoid what destiny has decreed. This would be injustice and tyranny, of which God is incapable from the perfection of his being.' To this doctrine, which diametrically opposes the system of the Sonnites, the Metoualis add certain ceremonies, which increase their mutual aversion. They curse Omar and Moaouia as rebels and usurpers; and celebrate Ali and Hosain as saints and martyrs. They begin their ablutions at the elbow, instead of the end of the finger, as is customary with the Turks; they think themselves defiled by the touch of strangers, and, contrary to the general practice of the East, neither eat nor drink out of a vessel which has been used by a person not of their sect, nor will they even sit with such at the same table.

"These doctrines and customs, by separating the Metoualis from their neighbours, have rendered them a distinct society. It is said they have long existed as a nation in this country, though their name has never been mentioned by any European writer before the present century; it is not even to be found in the maps of Danville. La Roque, who left their country not a hundred years ago, gives them the names of Amédiens. Be this as it may, in later times, their wars, robberies, success, and various changes of fortune, have rendered them of consequence in Syria. Till about the middle of this century, they only possessed Balbek, their capital, and a few places in the valley, and Anti-Lebanon, which seems to have been their original country. At that period we find them under a like

government with the Druses, under the rule of certain sheiks, with one principal chief of the family of Harfoush."

Subsequently to 1750, they established themselves in the mountainous districts of Bakaa, and got a footing in Lebanon, where they obtained lands belonging to the Maronites, almost as far as Besharrai. They even incommoded the Maronites so much as to oblige the Emir Yousif to attack them with open force, and to expel them; but, on the other side they advanced along the river even to the neighbourhood of Sour (Tyre). In this situation Shaik Daher found them when he managed to effect an alliance with them; they being able to bring into the field ten thousand horsemen, all resolute and formidable troops. Their courage, however, did not prevent their being open to accusations of predatory habits, of robberies committed on Christians and Turks, indiscriminately, of the Pachaliks of Sidon and Damascus, for which chastisement had often been demanded and denounced, but not so easily inflicted. Eventually they took possession of Sour, and made that town their head-quarters.

Sheik Daher, Governor of St. Jean d'Acre from 1750 to to 1776, an Arab by birth, and of Bedouin descent, was the son of a powerful native chief, whose territory extended to the north-west of Tiberius, and included the town of Safad. Daher, in 1749, rebelled against the Turkish authorities of Cæsarea, and took forcible possession of St. Jean d'Acre, in his 63rd year.

From that period Daher played the game of Mohammed Ali, Pacha of Egypt; professed the most devoted fidelity and submission to the Porte, and practised the most flagrant acts of rebellion and opposition to its authority—alternately bribing and cajoling, or secretly conspiring, or openly waging war, against the Sultan's officers and their forces.

"For some years, the Turkish Pachas of Said and Damascus," we are told by Volney, "had been incommoded by the Metoualis, who pillaged their lands and refused their tribute. Daher, sensible of the advantage to be made of these allies,

first interposed as mediator, and afterwards, in order to accommodate the parties, offered to become security for the Metoualis, and pay their tribute. The Pachas accepted this proposal, which rendered their revenues certain, and Daher was content with the bargain he had made, since he had secured the friendship of a people who could bring ten thousand horse into the field. . . . . About the year 1768, he solicited a permanent investiture of his government, for himself and his successor, and demanded to be proclaimed, 'Sheik of Acre, Prince of Princes, Governor of Nazareth, Tabaria, and Safad, and Sheik of all Galilee.' The Porte conceded everything to fear and money; but this proof of vanity awakened more and more her jealousy and displeasure."

So early as 1760, an enemy of Daher, a Mamalouk chief, named Osman, was appointed Pacha of Damascus, as a counterpoise to the dangerous Governor of Acre; and the two sons of Osman were made Pachas of Tripoli and Saide; and, in 1765, the government of Osman was further extended to Jerusalem and the whole of Palestine. The tyranny and rapacity of Osman Pacha throughout Palestine powerfully contributed to sustain Daher against the Porte. The people began to murmur on every side, and Palestine, emboldened by the vicinity of Egypt, now in a state of rebellion, threatened to call in a foreign protector.

Under these circumstances, Ali Bey, the conqueror of Mecca and the Said, turned his projects of aggrandisement towards Syria. The alliance of Daher, the war with the Russians, which entirely occupied the Turks, and the discontents of the people, all conspired to favour his ambition. He accordingly published a manifesto in 1770, in which he declared, that God having bestowed a signal benediction on his arms, he thought himself bound, in duty, to make use of them for the relief of the people, and to repress the tyranny of Osman in Syria.

He immediately dispatched a body of Mamalouks to Gaza, who seized on Ramla and Loud. Daher, two days later, made his appearance with his forces, and took possession of Jaffa

and Ramla, in which towns, as well as Loud, he placed garrisons. At this juncture, Mohammed Bey arrived in Palestine with the grand army, in the month of February, 1771, and followed the Sheik along the sea-coast to Acre. There, having been joined by twelve or thirteen hundred Metoualis, under the command of Nasif, and fifteen hundred Safadians, led by Ali, son of Daher he marched in April towards Damascus.

The Turks in every engagement with Daher and his Egyptian ally, were defeated. Darouish, son of Osmond, Pacha of Saide, had engaged the Druses in his cause, and fifteen hundred Okkals had arrived, under the command of Ali-Djambalat, to reinforce the garrison; while the Emir Yousef, descending into the valley of the Metoualis with twenty-five thousand men, laid everything waste with fire and sword. Ali Daher and Nasif, on this intelligence, directed their course instantly on that side, and, on the 21st of October, 1771, happened the action in which the advanced corps of five hundred Metoualis entirely defeated the whole army of the Druses, whose flight spread terror through Saide, whither they were closely pursued by the Safadians. Ali Djambalat, despairing to defend the town, evacuated it without delay; but not before his Okkals had pillaged it in their retreat. The Metoualis, finding it without defence, entered and plundered it in their turn.

The Porte, terrified at the defeats she had met with, both from the Russians and her rebellious subjects, now offered peace to Daher, on very advantageous conditions. To induce him to consent, she removed the Pachas of Damascus, Saide, and Tripoli; disavowed their conduct, and solicited a reconciliation with the Sheik. Daher, now eighty-five or eighty-six years old, was willing to accept this offer, that he might terminate his days in peace; but he was diverted from this intention by his minister, Ibrahim, who did not doubt but Ali Bey (who was then about to visit Syria, on his return to Egypt), would, the ensuing winter, proceed to the conquest of Syria, and would cede a considerable portion of that country to Daher.

The Porte now renewed the war against Sheik Daher. An army was sent against him. The forces which Daher could muster to oppose them might consist of five or six thousand Safadian and Metouali cavalry, eight hundred of Ali's Mamalouks, and about one thousand Mograbian infantry. Daher had secured the co-operation of some Russian vessels, to second his projected attack on the Turkish army extending along the shore, from the sea to the foot of the adjacent mountains. At the foot of the mountains the Druse allies of the Turks, armed with muskets, were drawn up.

On the side of Sheik Daher, the Metoualis and Safadians were extended on the plain, so as to present the greatest front possible to the Turks. The right wing consisted of Metoualis and the Mograb infantry, intended to oppose the Druses.

The Turks were completely routed; the Pachas of Damascus, Tripoli, and Said, and their troops, fled pell-mell.

The Druses, who never engage with good will on the side of the Turks, presently left the field, and hid themselves in their mountains, and in less than an hour the plain was cleared. The allies, satisfied with their victory, would not risk a pursuit, in a country which would become more difficult the nearer they approached Bairout; but the Russian ships, to punish the Druses, proceeded to cannonade that town, where they made a descent, and burnt three hundred houses.

Ali Bey and Daher, on their return to Acre, determined to take vengeance for acts of treachery of the people of Nablous and Jaffa, and in the beginning of July, 1772, appeared before the latter city, besieged it and took possession of it in February, 1773.

Ali Bey shortly after took his departure for Egypt.

At this time, a Syrian, named Ahmed Djezzar, a creature of the Turks, had been placed at the head of affairs in Beirout, by the Pacha of Damascus. No sooner had Djezzar been placed in power by the Turkish governor, than he determined to wield it for himself, professing, however, as is usual in such cases, to be the faithful slave and servant of the Sultan, and

only acting for his benefit against his unworthy employé in Damascus. Daher got up an expedition, both by sea and land, against Beirout.

Beirout was then a town largely inhabited, and frequented by the Druses. This wily people no sooner gained intelligence of Daher's projects, than they assembled and determined on contracting an alliance with Daher. This treaty was concluded near Sour, the site of ancient Tyre. Beirout was besieged by Daher, and obliged to capitulate; and Djezzar, the future ruler of St. Jean d'Acre, was carried to that town a prisoner, but in a short time contrived to effect his escape.

The defection of the Druses, on this occasion, from the Turks, had nothing in it of a novel character. A little later in 1775, they declined to come to the aid of Daher, when he was in need of their assistance, in fact in the last extremity. On that occasion, also, the Metoualis failed him.

In 1771, the Metoualis had been of great service to Ali Bey and Daher, against the Turks. But Emir Yousef having in their absence armed the Druses, ravaged their country. He was besieging the castle of Djezin, when the Metoualis, returning from Damascus, received intelligence of this invasion. At the relation of the barbarities committed by the Druses, an advanced corps, of only five hundred men, were so enraged, that they immediately rushed forward against the enemy, determined to perish in taking vengeance. But the surprise and confusion they occasioned, and the discord which reigned between the two factions of Mansour and Yousef, so much favoured this desperate attack, that the whole army, consisting of twenty-five thousand men, was completely overthrown.

In the following year, the affairs of Daher taking a favorable turn, the zeal of the Metoualis cooled towards him, and they finally abandoned him in the catastrophe in which he lost his life. But they have suffered for their imprudence, under the administration of the Pacha who succeeded him. Since the year 1777, Djezzar, master of Acre and Saide, has incessantly laboured to destroy them. His persecution forced them, in

1784, to a reconciliation with the Druzes, and to enter into an alliance with the Emir Yousef. Though reduced to less than seven hundred armed men, they did more in that campaign than fifteen or twenty thousand Druses and Maronites, assembled at Dair-el-Kamar. They alone took the strong fortress of Mar-Djebaa, and put to the sword fifty or sixty Arnaouts, who defended it. But the misunderstanding which prevailed among the chiefs of the Druses, having rendered abortive all their operations, the Pacha has obtained possession of the whole valley, and the city of Balbek itself. At this period, not more than five hundred families of the Metoualis remained, who took refuge in Anti-Lebanon, and the Lebanon of the Maronites; and, driven as they now are from their native soil, it is probable they will be totally annihilated, and even their very name extinct.

At the close of 1775, Sheik Daher perished on the field of battle, upwards, it is said, of ninety years of age; not killed by the Turkish enemy he was fighting, but perfidiously slain by one of his own mercenaries, a Mograb or Barbary soldier.

When the usual Turkish ceremony was performed in this case of cutting off the head of a slain rebel governor, pickling it and sending it off to be presented to the Sultan, Djezzar was temporarily appointed the successor of Daher by the Capitan Pacha, by whose measures Daher's final ruin had been effected; and a little later, the Sultan appointed Djezzar, pacha of Acre and Sidon.*

With this episode in Turkish history, the author of this work is only concerned as far as it relates to the part taken by the Metoualis and the Druses, in the contentions and warfare of their rulers.

* Travels through Syria and Egypt in 1783, 1783, and 1735, by C. F. Volney. Vol. 2.

CHAPTER XI.

The Influence of Russia over the Great Mass of the Christian Population of the Turkish Empire.—The Exercise and Results of that Influence at Different Periods of the Greek Revolution.

THE political influence of Russia in Turkey is the result of its religious influence there.

The identity of the religion of Russia with that of the great majority of the Christian communities scattered over the provinces of the Turkish Empires, and concentrated in Constantinople, constitutes the first great element in the union of interests, influences, and sympathies of the Russian and Greek populations. This union is based, moreover, on something stronger than an exercise of the reasoning powers on the part of the Greeks. It has its foundation in the permanent religious instinct of the people, which travellers, who hate all religions but their own, call prevalent religious fanaticism. The same permanent religious principle, idea, or instinct, certainly prevails in Russia, and we need not wonder at its power or permanency. The Greek religion is not only the law-established religion of the State, but no other religion enters into competition with it. Why is that religious principle, idea, or instinct so permanently fixed in the hearts and heads of the Greeks of the Orthodox Church throughout the Levant?

Because, in the first place, their Church has undergone persecution and spoliation.

The Greek clergy have acquired the power and influence they have so long and successfully exercised over their flock, and

continue to exercise in Turkey—simply because they have been always true to the cause of nationality of their countrymen, no less than to the interests of the Greek Church, as they understood them, in all simplicity and sincerity of religious belief.

Herein is the chief danger which menaces the Turkish Empire, the field that is thus opened, in all its provinces, for Russian influence, and the operations of secret emissaries of Russia.

All strength of religious belief, in any Church that is not Protestant, passes for a fierce fanaticism, therefore, all the efforts of that Russian influence in Turkey, is ascribed to that spirit, or the pretension to it of a fraudulent policy, seeking only territorial aggrandisement, and regardless of any results of a religious nature.

My belief is, there is not a people in Christendom more sincerely and strongly attached to their religion than the Russians.

In the event of Russian interference in the affairs of Turkey, effectually taking place, the Sclavonic populations, in all probability, would be among the first of the Christian races to espouse the cause of Russia, if their animosities with the Greeks, even those of their own Orthodox Church, did not tend to embarrass, I will not say hinder, any combined action between them.

Whenever the opportunity comes, and Turkey's weakness presents it to them, I believe the instincts of race will prevail over any religious antipathies that now exist, and the common tie of Sclavonic origin, which binds the Wallachian and Moldavian with the great Sclavonic hive of Russia, will be found more powerful in its antagonism to Turkey, than any array of hostile feelings on the parts of Christian communities, slightly differing in religious rites, against each other.

Strange to say, the power of England, exercised at the Ottoman Porte, has led, even of late years, to the deprivation of the Greek Patriarch by the Sultan, and ordering the synod to proceed to the election of another.

In 1840, the English Government, through its ambassador, complained of the Greek Patriarch exercising his spiritual functions in a way injurious to the interests of British rule in the Ionian Islands, transgressing the limits of ecclesiastical authority, and incriminating the power exercised by British functionaries in the Protectorate.

The poor Greek Patriarch of Constantinople in the legitimate exercise of his spiritual rights, for expressing in his pastoral communications to his clergy, his sorrow and indignation at the cruel treatment of Greek ecclesiastics in the Ionian Islands at the hands of Sir Henry Ward, at the summary executions of them, and all the attending circumstances of a revolting character, which have been reprobated elsewhere, in the British Press and Parliament, was sacrificed by the Sultan at the request of the British ambassador, instigated by the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, to punish the head of that religion, whose priests he had *suspended*, with a vengeance—by the neck—for calling in question those acts of his, which brought so much disgrace on the British name in her colonial government. The late Sir Henry Ward, whose exploits in public life we have recently seen so glorified in the British Press, has probably done more to make British power odious, not only in the Ionian islands, but throughout Greece, than any individual of his nation has ever done before.

But what will the eulogists of Turkish rule over Christian Rajahs say to this sacrifice of a Greek Patriarch by the Sultan, at the bidding of a European power of a different religion? We are constantly dosed *usque ad nauseum*, with hyperbolical commendations of Turkish toleration, protection of Christian Churches, perfect independence of Patriarchs, and security for prelates, priests, and monks. Let those who administer those nauseous doses of admiration for Turkish tolerance, turn to the Imperial edict, depriving the Greek Patriarch of his office, published in the *Moniteur Ottomane*, the 14th March, 1848.

The earliest known exercise of secret Russian influence in the territory of Turkey, of a hostile nature to the Ottoman Empire,

was in the reign of the Empress Anne, 1730—41, when Russian emissaries were sent into Epirus, and the mountains of Thessally, to stir up the Greek Rajahs to insurrection, scattering gold and inflammatory proclamations with unsparing hands.

The Greeks made a partial insurrection, and were perfidiously abandoned to their fate by their Russian sympathisers, at the peace of 1739, as they always subsequently have been, as often as they rebelled and have been unsuccessful.

In the reign of the Empress Elizabeth, new Russians were sent into Greece (1741—62), and stealthily sowed the seeds of disaffection to the Turkish Government, scattered vague rumours of war against the Ottoman Porte, whispered mysterious communications, semi-religious allusions to scriptural predictions of help from on high, and hopes of approaching emancipation for the people of the holy Orthodox, especially among the Mainotes.

The Greeks, in all their insurrections, have been powerfully acted on by those vague, mysterious allusions to their religion, and to their deliverance from thraldom, on account of it, at the hands of the Russians.

In 1770, new Russian intrigues in Greece, led to another abortive insurrection, and all the inevitably calamitous consequences of abortive insurrections to the defeated insurgents.

The foreign power by which they were instigated to rebel, as usual, ultimately abandoned them to their fate.

Fifty thousand Greeks were massacred, while the Russians looked quietly from their vessels on the conflagration of the town and villages of their slaughtered dupes. So much for hopes of deliverance from servitude at the hands of foreign powers, pretending to sympathise with an oppressed people, purposing only to promote its own selfish policy. It was during this insurrection the Turkish fleet was destroyed at Tchesmè in July, 1770.

The treaty between Russia and the Porte of Kainardji, in 1779, conferred considerable advantages on the Greeks, and

caused the latter more than ever to regard the Russians as their natural protectors. By one of the articles of the treaty above mentioned, the Porte engaged to protect the Christian religion and its churches in its Empire, and to permit the accredited ministers of Russia at Constantinople to represent to the Porte any grievances the Christian Rayahs might have to complain of, and to remonstrate with the Turkish Governors against any injury or injustice done them.

A new treaty of peace between those Powers, that of Jassy, in January, 1792, which recognised the annexation of the Crimea to Russia, was productive of further advantages to the Greeks.

The Czar, Peter, made no secret of his views of the duties imposed on him and his successors, as he piously believed, by divine Providence to dismember the Turkish Empire, and make Constantinople the metropolis of Russia, the great emporium of the commerce of the east.

In the year 1720, Peter the Great concluded a treaty with the Porte, in which, for the first time, Russia, after the example of the Catholic Powers, stipulates for the protection of Russian monks and pilgrims to Jerusalem.

The 11th article of this treaty, which was confirmed by the same article of the treaty of Belgrade, in 1739, is the origin of the protectorate, which the czars, at a later period, claimed over the Greeks in Turkey. It runs thus:—

"The merchants of both nations shall enjoy perfect security in travelling and trafficking between the two countries. The Russians shall make pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and other holy places, and they shall not be subject, either at Jerusalem or elsewhere, to any tribute, karadj, pekasch, nor to any pecuniary exaction whatever for their passports. Russian ecclesiastics remaining in the territories of the Porte, shall not be molested."

Fortune, in arresting the progress of Peter the Great at the foot of the Pruth, suspended the execution of his projects; but the design of stirring up revolt in Greece, at a fitting

moment never was abandoned. It passed as a tradition to his successors. The master design of Peter the Great was transmitted to them in a code of testamentary instructions of a remarkable character. The authenticity of this document has been called in question, but the genuine state Russian character of the secret haute politique, of the instructions, admits of no doubt or denial. It may certainly be said of it, "s'il n'est vrai, c'est bien trouvè."

Russian designs against Turkey are of a very different form from those against Hindostan.

Captain Rollo Burslem, in a work entitled, "A Peep into Turkistan" (Lon. 8vo. 1846), gives an interesting account of those regions which a Russian army would have to traverse that was destined to invade Hindostan, and with that view was to reach Affghanistan.

Captain Burslem explored a part of Turkistan which he believes was never before visited by a European. A great tract of country between Ghoree and Badighar, of about eighty miles extent. One of those passes of perilous and difficult defiles between the Russian territory and Affghanistan, which, notwithstanding their utter impracticability for routes to be traversed by an army of Europeans, at the period of our Affghanistan war, served to frighten these islands from their propriety as fraught with danger from Russia to the Indian Empire of Great Britain.

Of the immense difficulty that a modern army of considerable numbers, with all its incumbrances, would have to encounter in such a country; of the hopelessness of preserving any efficiency or even a tithe of the numerical strength of an army marched through such regions as those visited by Captain Burslem, that intelligent officer leaves his readers in no doubt.

The extensive regions of Turkistan, through which he travelled, are subject to great and sudden changes of temperature, prejudicial to health. The soil of the extensive plains is for the most part poor and barren, patches of verdure, with luxuriant grass, are the exceptions; and dreary wastes of vast

extent, without water, or traces of cultivation, or sign of former habitation, a vestige of the wreck of past civilisation, are the rule.

"When we consider (says Captain Burslem) the passes of Turkistan embrace only a small part of the distance to be traversed by an army from the west, we may well dismiss from our minds that ridiculous impression, once so prevalent in India, that is now justly denominated *Aupophobia*. What a fearful amount of human suffering might have been averted! What national disgrace might have been avoided! What millions of treasure might have been saved, had the authorities of India but examined the practicability of an invasion, which Russia had too much wisdom ever seriously to contemplate.*"

Be it borne in mind these reflections of an intelligent military man, were made shortly after the disastrous Affghanistan war with Great Britain.

There is a remarkable notice in Eton's "Survey of the Turkish Empire," third edition, 1801, of a project of a French officer, Monsieur de St. Yenie, pressed on the Empress Catherine of Russia, about 1780, of a Russian expedition to be sent against the English in Hindostan, through Bochkara to Cashemire, and thence to Bengal. The projector had formed a similar plan for destroying the British dockyards and vessels of war in them, and executed a similar ingenious device for the destruction of the Dutch arsenal. The Empress, we are told by Mr. Eton, received the project favorably, and foresaw little difficulty in transporting an army through Bochkara, or danger of encountering any formidable Mohammedan resistance, inasmuch as a part of the project was to re-establish the Mogul Emperor in India, and place a Mogul-Mohammedan Prince on the throne at Delhi. The projector stated that there were passes through the mountains that rendered the march of an invading Russian army into India, an easy matter, and that he had seen people who had been sent there to examine these passes by M. de Vergennes, the French minister.

* Captain Burslem's Peep into Turkistan, p. 177.

The map, accompanying the projected route, was duly examined and highly approved by the Empress. But Prince Potemken, despite his enmity to the English as well as the Turks, ridiculed the project, and no doubt that able and astute Russian minister, had good reasons for so doing, notwithstanding the reminiscences of many successful invasions of Hindostan, of Timour's expedition in 1398, of Nadir Scha's in 1738, and of Abdallah, several times from 1748 to 1765.

In the reign of Catherine, the designs of Russia against Turkey took the form of a policy, whose key-note was the necessity of Constantinople being made a part of the Russian Empire. In the correspondence of the Prince de Ligne, we find a letter dated from a town in the Crimea, the 1st of June, 1787, wherein the Prince, speaking of the conversations he had held with the Empress Catherine and the Emperor Joseph of Austria, on the subject of the Turkish Empire, says :—

"Their Majesties, now and then, touched on the subject of those poor devils of Turks, and some hints were thrown out in a quiet sort of way. As an amateur of *virtu*, I spoke of re-establishing the Greeks and talked of Alcibiades: Catherine was for resuscitating Lycurgus and Solon; but Joseph, who thought more of the future than the past, more of the positive and the practical than the ideal, exclaimed, 'What the devil will you do with Constantinople?'" And Ubicini states it was during this visit to the Crimea that the project of seizing on the Ottoman Empire was agreed on between Catherine the 2nd and the Emperor Joseph, though the final details of its dismemberment were reserved for a future period.

Peter's successor, Catherine the 1st, carried out the views, and acted on the testamentary instructions of her father, in regard to Turkey. She began the process of dismemberment, by making the Crimea a Russian province.

The conversation of the august sovereigns in the Crimea, was soon followed, in 1787, by the war of Russia with the "poor devils of Turks," who continued, however, to baffle the

chief designs of the august sovereigns. The Turkish territory of the Crimea, however, became a Russian province.

The European powers, in 1787 and 1788, as in 1828, looked on as passive spectators of the struggle between Russia and Turkey. Russia, from the first, could always speculate largely on the baseness of Austria and Prussia, and the readiness of either power to connive at or to promote any policy of hers, that had for its aim, territorial robbery or aggrandizement. At all times the baseness, treachery, and perfidiousness of Austria, especially in its character of a great European power, always truckling to powerful despotism and great enmity to national right, has been uniform. So long as Turkey was powerful, and brutally oppressive towards its christian Rayahs, all her sympathies were with Turkey, and her best secret services given to her perfidiously, to turn any resistance of those oppressed christian races on her borders, into abortive insurrection.

One need not be much surprised at the sure support in all emergencies, that Russia, in any scheme of plunder or state burglary, might expect from a new state like Prussia, composed of plundered territories, the result of German raids and ravages in countries bordering on Russia and Austria, of wholesale robberies of small states and colonies on the part of Teutonic Knights, of the merging of one of those potent and ruthless brigands, the Grand Master of the order, into a duke of East Prussia, an acknowledged fief of Poland; and in 1594, of the union of that dukedom of Prussia, with the Electorate of Brandenburgh as it exists at the present time, that Prussia, whose independance as a state under Frederick William, surnamed The Great, was only acknowledged by Poland so late as 1657. The Emperor Alexander, the great Napoleon's friend, "a Greek of the Lower Empire," full of fraud and dissimulation, spoke of the possession of Constantinople as a necessity for Russia. To use his words, "Russia must have the key of her own house."

Alexander's successor, the Emperor Nicholas—a fanatic, and a man of very inferior intellectual powers, a despicable prince who set no value on truth, nor attached any importance to fidelity in the observance of a promise, or of binding obligations in an oath, like the Empress Catherine—had a pet project of annexation of Turkey to the Russian dominions, and he tried hard that "Russia should have the key of her own house," and he discovered the poor devils of Turks were sick men, and it only remained for Europe to bury the Mosque with honour, and to remove the remains of the late sick man to a quiet grave on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus.

In the history of people robbed of their independence, and whose condition has become one of long continued servitude, humiliation, and abject existence, nothing can be more monotonous than its records of suffering and subjection. There are no great changes of fortune, no stirring events of great pith and moment, no sudden outbursts of enthusiasm, flights of genius, or glare of grandeur, or transient brilliancy of any signal exploit, or noble effort to shake off oppression in the pages of that sad history. Or if now and then its monotony is relieved for a moment, by a clamorous resistance to the occasional caprices of despotism, the miseries of the sequel of an abortive insurrection tend only to render the narrative still more painful. "Years, and even ages of servitude," says M. Villemain, "roll on in tedious uniformity. Generation succeeds generation without leaving a trace behind; there are no events to vivify the scene. There is nothing new, even in the sufferings of the oppressed; and their misfortunes are as monotonous as the pity they inspire."

The time, however, came when this long monotony in the history of Greek servitude was broken.

From the time of the treaty of Kainardji, in 1779, the Greeks became eminently commercial and maritime; and with surprising rapidity, equipped multitudes of trading vessels in the ports of Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece, and the principal islands of the Archipelago. The prosperity that ensued, the

impetus given to intellectual pursuits, the establishment, above all, of schools, in which Greek nationality was not sedulously suppressed or banned, as in their former places of primitive instruction, were the precursors of Greek independence and an Hellenic kingdom in our days.

Rhigas, of Thessally, was the first of his countrymen to stir in this cause, and was the first martyr of it. His grand idea was the regeneration of his countrymen, by creating in Greece a passion for its literature, and a love for his beautiful country. *A man* of the name of Thomas Daves, half a century later than Rhigas, determined to regenerate his countrymen, resolved, in Ireland, to attempt the same object, through the same intellectual agencies.

"In 1796, Rhigas repaired to Vienna, to mature his enterprise, and to prepare for its execution. From thence he corresponded with the members of the Hetairia, who were dispersed through different parts of Greece, and with the authorities of the French directory. He there edited a Greek journal for the instruction of his fellow countrymen, and printed his translation of '*Le Voyage de Jeune Anacharsis.*' He also constructed a map of Greece, and had it engraved on a large scale, with the names of places in Romaic, which he probably intended to serve as a basis of operation for the Hetairists. At the same time, his odes and songs, written likewise in Romaic, the language of the people, and inspired by the fervour of patriotism, aroused in the hearts of all, an enthusiasm for liberty and for their country. His famous song, which has been said to be an imitation of the Marseillaise, 'Sons of the Greeks, arise!' and his other equally famous hymn of the mountaineers, 'Heroes, how long shall we dwell in the mountains?' were sung and echoed throughout Greece."

In 1821, while the Greek revolution was spreading terror over the Turkish Empire, another insurrection having broken out in Wallachia and Moldavia, the old panacea, and "sovereign remedy for an inward bruise" of the Turkish state—a series of massacres of the Christians of the Turkish capital, and through-

out several of the provinces—was had recourse to. An able writer and zealous champion of the Turkish Empire, M. Ubicini, informs us that the government, having proclaimed "the holy war" in Constantinople by the Hatti Scheriffe of March the 31st, 1821, the lives of the entire Christian community were placed in the most imminent peril.

In the middle of the 17th century, some twenty families of Greeks, old or opulent, who claimed to be the descendants of the nobles of their race before the Mohammedan conquest, and some of them even heirs of the last imperial Princes of Constantinople and Trebizond, existed in a quarter of Constantinople called the Fanar or Fanal. Their acquaintance with foreign languages—for which acquirement their race appears to have a peculiar aptitude, the genius of it, moreover, improved by education, which rendered craft and intellectual activity peculiarly adapted for employment in a community where all mental energies were dormant—made these Fanariotes first useful, and in a short time indispensable to their Ottoman lords as interpreters, secretaries, employés, and various influential and confidential officers of the Porte.

For nearly seventy years, they maintained their position and ascendency over all other raiahs, servile and sordid, they were wholly devoted to the acquisition of wealth, and the promotion of Turkish interests. But a change appears to have come over their views, and the tendencies of their prosperity, from the time that the secret society of the Hetairia, and the labours of the martyr Rhigas had taken firm root in the minds of the Greeks of the Morea, Moldavia, and Wallachia.

The Fanariotes became patrons of learning, and founders of Greek schools and colleges in Constantinople, Smyrna, Salonica, and some of the islands of the Archipelago, and continued so to be to the time of their downfall in 1820.

In 1814, a new Hellenic society, with the name of Philomusii, was formed in Vienna, at the head of which was Count Capo d'Istrias, a Carfiote, in the services of Russia. Strange to say, the society was formed during the sitting of the Con-

gress at Vienna, and some of the sovereigns present, and the representatives of others became the patrons of it. We need not, however, wonder that the Emperor Alexander was one of them, for the professed object of the Philo-musii, to extend education and promote literary objects in Greece, was in reality to give an impulse to Greek nationalism, and secretly to revive the cause for which Rhigas died. From 1814 to 1820, the leaders of the Philo-musii, professing moral force doctrines, and those of the Hetairia confederacy, disciples of the physical force school, with an organisation nearly similar to the Carbonari of Italy, carried on their machinations against the Turkish government, conjointly; and in 1820, their numbers were estimated at upwards of two hundred thousand. Their revolutionary phase dates from 1818, when an insurrection was attempted in Servia, which, though unsuccessful, was not unproductive of advantages to the Greek cause. In the beginning of 1821, Alexander Ypsilantis unfurled the flag of the Hetairists in the Danubian provinces, and made another abortive insurrection, which Russia, true to her old system of abandoning those whom she had compromised, the moment their cause was lost, denounced in a solemn ukase of the Emperor, and played the same perfidious part she had done in the Morea in 1770, and still more recently in Servia in 1818, when she first encouraged and then disavowed the attempt of Czerny-Georgy.

When the news of the insurrection attempted by Ypsilantis, and a similar outbreak in the Morea, reached Constantinople, in the beginning of 1821, conflagrations in the capital, and massacres of Christians of all sects, but especially of Greeks, on a grand scale followed.

The absence of a newspaper press in the Turkish dominions heretofore, in all panics, has been usually supplied by other means of giving vent to great public fears; popular cries of any kind, for justice or for vengeance; cries of religion in danger, or of the State on the verge of ruin. A conflagration is had recourse to. Pious political Dervishes, in such emergencies,

go about the city, in the dusk of the evening, wildly and fiercely stirring up the dormant fears and fanaticism of the multitude, and causing a publication of popular opinion to be made, by setting fire to a particular quarter of the city; or, if they want to do something equivalent to an appearance of leading articles on the same subject, in the columns of the *Times* newspaper, for several successive days, they have houses in different quarters of the city, set fire to, night after night, for a few days, till an impression is made on the mind of the Turkish Government by this public mode of manifesting popular feelings of alarm or discontent. Thus Turkish agitators have been so long spared the expense and trouble of printing their wrongs, terrors, or opinions on public matters.

The conduct of Austria in every phase of the Greek revolution, was alike cruel, treacherous, and ungenerous to the struggles of this Christian people. Those who wish to see Austrian power renewed in Italy, must be quite unacquainted with the history of the turpitude of her diplomacy in the east, and of her rule of galling, stupidly insulting tyranny in Italy.

The Greeks, certainly will never forget nor forgive the foul murder of their Rhigas, to which Austria was not only privy, but a prime participator in its guilt. When Rhigas had completely organised his first effort for the liberation of Greece, and the Greeks only awaited the signal from him, to rise in insurrection in every part of the Pelponnessus, and was about to embark at Trieste for the Morea, with eight of his companions, he was arrested by the Austrian authorities, by the order of their government; and, by the Austrian police, this truly noble and greatly gifted man (then in his 33rd year) was delivered up into the hands of the Turks, perfectly conscious, as the Austrian Government and Austrian authorities must have been, that they were delivering him over to certain death. And as a matter of course, Rhigas was put to death by the Turks, at Belgrade, the 8th of May, 1798.

The corpse of the patriot who was slain, fairly, perhaps, by the Turks, foully murdered by the Austrians, was flung into the

Danube. All the waters of that deep river cannot cover the guilt of that foul act of Austria—its participation in the death of Rhigas.

Some years later, another Greek insurrection broke out in the Moldo-Wallachian territory, at the head of which was Alexander Ypsilantis, and after a signal defeat at Dragachan, had to seek refuge in the Austrian territory. The unfortunate insurgent chief was immediately arrested, and sent to the Hungarian fortress of Mongatz, and there kept in captivity for some years. Austria probably thought the blood of Rhigas was enough on its hands, and on its conscience, if I may be allowed to use that expression in connection with anything of State in Austria.

No sooner had the Turkish Government manifested its power in Constantinople in massacres of its Christian subjects, in 1820 and 1821, than the entire Greek population of the Morea manifested its revenge in a series of revolts, commencing at Calamata, a southern town of the Morea. The chief promoter of, if not leader in this revolt, was Alexander Mavrocordato.

On the First of January, 1822, *the Senate, or National Congress of representatives, was established at Calamata*, transferred its sittings to Tripolitza, thence to Argos, and from Argos to Epidaurus, and from that spot issued forth its memorable declaration of independence. The executive government was vested in a commission of five members, and the office of president was conferred on Prince Alexander Mavrocordato. The declaration of independence is well worthy of being recorded and remembered by all states struggling for their liberties.

The declaration was as follows :—

"*In the name of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity, the Greek nation, wearied by the dreadful weight of Ottoman oppression, and resolved to break its yoke, though at the price of the greatest sacrifices, proclaims to-day, before God and men, by the organ of its lawful representatives, met in a national assembly, its Independence.*"*

* Ubicini, "Lettres sur la Turquie," vol. 2.

I am disposed to think that the Greek declaration of independence is a nobler document than that of the Americans, and that the recently emancipated states of Italy have not put forward any declaration at all comparable to it.

The wholesale indiscriminate massacres of Christians in Constantinople, the murder of the Greek Patriarch, and the Bishops of Ephesus, Nicomedia, and Achiale, by the Turks, with the sanction, and under the eyes of the authorities, in the latter end of 1820, and beginning of 1821, gave a greater stimulus to the cause of the Greek revolutionists than it ever before received. Thousands of Greeks, who never before dreamt of joining their countrymen in arms in the Morea, now flocked to their standard of independence. In England, France, and America, the Greek cause was taken up with extraordinary enthusiasm. Byron gave heart and soul, his glorious genius, his means, his life to it.*

It has been the fashion of late years, to ridicule the enthusiastic, generous support given in England to the Greek cause of independence. Unfortunately the tendency of our times is to ridicule everything that is *unselfishly unsectarian and unprecedented*, and at the same time generous and enthusiastic in our sympathies with the aims, efforts, and aspirations of people struggling to regain lost rights, or to establish a new national regime of independence.

And yet England has more just reason to be proud of her efforts, pecuniary, parliamentary, and literary, to aid the Greeks in their struggle for independence, than of any exercise of dip-

* In the beginning of 1824, the author of this work, then in Naples, was advised very strongly by the late Earl of Blessington, to proceed to Messalonghe in the capacity of medical attendant of Lord Byron. When Lord Byron was departing from Genoa on his expedition, Lord Blessington urged on him earnestly to take with him a medical attendant in whom he placed much confidence. Lord Byron declined to do so, but subsequently he expressed his regret that he had not acceded to Lord Blessington's wishes. It was in these circumstances that the latter urged me to proceed to Messalonghe, furnished with a letter to Lord Byron which could not fail to result in the appointment designed for me. I did not require many arguments to induce me to act on this proposal. I sailed from Naples for Smyrna, and on my arrival at the latter place, the first news that reached me was the death of Lord Byron.

lomatic astuteness which has taken place in recent times, in behalf of oppressed nationalities. The services rendered to the Greeks were without any reference to their religion, commerce, geographical position, or the bearing of the latter on mercantile or naval interests in the Mediterranean. Greece, be it remembered, from first to last, struggled not only for her independence, but for her religion. She never compromised the latter from any views of expediency, or of deference to any prejudices or opinions well or ill founded, against that opinion on the part of those Christian Powers she looked to for succour, and received assistance from.

The Greeks began their revolution with the ministers of religion on their side; they ended it successfully with the same natural protectors of their country's civil and religious rights, behind the scenes of all those aspirations which terminated in an independent kingdom and emancipated Church.

England, I say, has reason to be proud of the generous and unselfish part she acted in this great struggle of the Greeks for their independence, and grand achievement of its attainment.

By the Protocols of London, of the 5th of February, and the 7th of March, 1830, Greece was erected into an independent kingdom, comprising the Peloponessus, Allica, Euboæ, and all the territory south of the Gulf of Volo, to the eastern point of the Gulf of Arta. And by the subsequent Protocol of July following, the Ottoman Porte completed the establishment of the limits of the new Hellenic kingdom; by which it ceded more than seven hundred square geographical miles of territory, and nearly a million subjects, in consideration of an indemnity of twelve millions of francs—say, in round numbers, half a million sterling.

The Turkish provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia, by the treaty of Paris, of 1856, were declared a constitutional government, under one elective prince, two ministers, two elective assemblies, and a central commission. From the "Almanach de Gotha," for 1860, the following details are taken:—

"Wallachia contains a population of about two millions of inhabitants, and a hundred thousand strangers, subjects of other States.

Moldavia contains a population of 1,400,000.

The Greek religion (separated from the Roman Catholic Church) is professed by the inhabitants of both principalities.

The Roman Catholics amount to about 50,000; Protestants, 10,000.

Servia, under its own Prince, elected in 1858, and governmental administration, contained a population, in 1854, of 958,000 inhabitants.

Montenegro, under its own Prince, and administration of government, has a population of 125,000 inhabitants, chiefly of the Greek religion separated from the Church of Rome.

CHAPTER XII.

The Syrian Massacres of 1860.

THE recent atrocities committed by the Druses on the Maronites, connived at by the Turkish authorities in Damascus, Deir-el-Kammar, Hasbeya, Rasheya, and numerous minor towns and villages of Mount Lebanon, are spoken of and looked upon in Europe as casual occurrences, as isolated unexampled outbursts of fanaticism, and religious strife, on the part of ignorant, intolerant, and besotted people in a Turkish province, one portion of whose inhabitants belong to a Christian sect in communion with the Roman Catholic church, and another to a Pagan community, who, when it suits their purpose, profess to be Mohammedans, and on other occasions, pretend to English missionaries to be favourably disposed towards Protestant Christianity.

These massacres are to be considered in connection with the general character of Turkish rule, its uniform savagery, intolerance, and fanaticism, in relation to the Christian subjects of the Porte; and the persistent nature of the hostility of English and French interests in the Levant, and especially in Syria, to the influence severally exercised in that country by the Consular authority of each power.

The French sovereigns from the time of St. Louis, claim, in virtue of treaties, the right of protecting the Roman Catholics of the Turkish Empire in general, the Maronites of Syria in particular.

The English government since 1825, exercises the privilege of protecting Protestant missions in Syria, for the conversion of Jews and Christians who are Roman Catholics, and through its Consuls, carries on for its missionaries a perpetual war with the Maronite community especially, and through them espouses on all occasions of sectarian strife and bloodshed, the side of their enemies, the Druses, so far as defending their acts and inculpating their opponents.

Such is the state of things in Syria, which is taken advantage of, ever and anon, in Constantinople when a panic has occurred. Because a war with Russia is apprehended, or there is a dearth of corn, or a dread of insurrection in some Danubian province, or a want of money in the treasury to pay the troops and employés. No people are so subject to panics as the Turks of large towns and cities, and nothing can be more invariable than the form in which all Turkish panics are manifested—namely, in headlong impulses of furibund fanaticism, prompting the panic-stricken to shed the blood of Christians, to take vengeance on the Giaours for the fears and suspicions they are the occasion of; to suspect all the Rayahs of the provinces, as well as those of Stamboul, as leagued in a conspiracy to murder all true believers, and therefore to be beforehand with them, to let the Dervishes loose on them in the capital or some particular province, and have a religious war and a massacre, piously, and at first, covertly counselled and enjoined.

It is not in the official correspondence of Consuls, with their several governments, or in those papers relative to the Syrian massacres laid before the parliament, that we are likely to discover any trace of the true origin of them. Those papers may be read from beginning to end without finding any clue to the unaccountable conduct of people of a different race altogether from the Druses, who manifestly connived at their atrocities; nay, participated therein, and were the projectors of that conspiracy against the Christians of all sects and races in Syria.

The originators of that conspiracy were not Druses nor Metoualis nor Ansayriens; *they were Ottoman Turks; the*

conspiracy was hatched in Constantinople. The bond that united its members, the life and soul, the breath and the heart's blood of it was fanaticism; the object of it was to create a revolution out of hatred of the reforms that had been fatal to the Janissaries in 1826, had introduced the Hatti-sheriff of Gulhanch and Tanzimat of 1839, which conferred privileges on the Christian Rayahs, and violated the principles of the Koran, and had given power and influence at the Porte to the representatives of European nations, who were in the sight of all true moslems, mere dogs, children of the shitan, Nazarenes, infidels, all that is impious and infamous—in one word—Giaours.

The vile policy of Turkey, the guilt of which, however, is not confined altogether to a Mohammedan government, has ever been to keep the different races and sects of its empire at daggers drawn; to keep them wrangling and jangling among themselves about matters of opinion, differences of religion, race and rights, established by prescription, or claimed in virtue of an ancient capitulater, and a prior or a better title than that of others to protection or pre-eminence. By this policy of weakening a people, composed of different races and religious communities, the Turkish Empire has ever sought its strength; but the advantages derived from it are necessarily only temporary. The time must come when they will not only cease to exist, but when the results of this policy, persisted in for ages, must prove detrimental to the state—nay, destructive to its true interests.

In the spring of 1860, advantage was taken for the promotion of the interests and objects of Turkish fanaticism, of the jealousies and animosities always in existence in Syria, between the different creeds and races, because always fomented by the Turkish authorities; and from the year 1825, unhappily greatly aggravated since the Consuls of foreign nations became more prominently protectors and partizans of missionaries of the churches, propagation associations and Bible societies of their several countries.

Since the last-mentioned period, the interests of the Maronites

have been taken up by the Consuls and missionaries of France, those of "the Orthodox Greeks," by the Consuls and clergy of their co-religionists of Russia; those of the Druses, by the Consuls and agents and ministers of the Bible societies of England. The legitimate duties of the Consuls of those three great powers, those duties connected with the interests of the commerce, the political influence, the civilization of these several countries, are, to a very great extent, subordinated to the interests of proselytising institutions, and the views respecting them, of ministers of religion, exceedingly inimical to other ecclesiastics and communities of Christians out of the pale of their own church establishment.

In 1825, when the new Anglican element of discord was brought into the Syrian agglomeration of adverse creeds and races, there was no field open for the new comers into the Turkish territory for proselytism, except that of Mohammedanism or of Judæism. The former, from the beginning, offered no hope of success at all, and none has been realised in it. The latter afforded no grounds for any expectation of success, except that amount of it which could be bought, and must be dearly paid for.

Any success, then, deserving of the name, that could be achieved by Protestant missionaries in Syria, must be obtained by proselytism directed against Roman Catholic communites, such as the Maronites and united Armenians, or against the orthodox Greek community; and it is hardly necessary to say that no success could be achieved in either of those Christian communities, (that had subsisted for centuries in the midst of Mohammedan persecution), by the missionaries of a religion, differing from theirs, recently introduced amongst them, without occasioning feelings of bitterness and sectarian hate—the most diabolical of all kind of hatred.

These feelings were indeed excited and exasperated to a great degree of fierce animosity at the time that the conspiracy was concocted in Constantinople against Christians in the Turkish empire, the first design of which was to effect the extermination of the Christians of all Christian sects in Syria, but

especially of the Maronites, and to make the Druses instrumental to the execution of this project.

This is the opinion of all the intelligent ecclesiastics, heads of houses and of orders, connected with Roman Catholic missions in Syria and Constantinople, whom I have met with in the East; and likewise of all those literary and political persons whom I have met with in France, by whom this subject has been studied with care, and with access to the reports of the Consuls in Syria, made to the French Government.

The facts in the various reports of the massacres, in those especially of an official character, that bear on this opinion of the Turkish origin of the Syrian massacres, are scattered over a vast number of documents, and thus separately encountered, do not strike the casual reader as strong evidence of the guilt of the contrivers of those massacres being Turks. It is only when one has given close and undivided attention to the several accounts, that a conclusion is come to, or rather is forced on him; namely, that it is impossible to understand the concurrence of numerous circumstances taking place at one time, corresponding in different districts, all tending to one point; the connivance at, and complicity with, the murderous acts of the Druses, without coming to the conclusion that these acts were planned, secretly suggested, counselled, and directed by Mussulmans for fanatical purposes.

We find by the official papers that the principal massacres all took place within a period of four or five weeks. That they were preceded by visits of Dervishes in several localities, whose mission seemed to be to stir up fanatical feelings, to preach up, in fact, a holy war.* The Turkish authorities of high rank, including the Pachas, Mudirs or Governors, with one or two

* July 8, 1858, just before the Syrian massacres of June and July, 1860, Consul Finn, of Jerusalem, writes to the Earl of Malmesbury, referring to the Mohammedan tumults and murders at Jeddo, observes, "In the presence of such events, it seems necessary to mention to your Lordship, what, at other times, might be scarcely worth reporting, namely, the great number of Durweeshes in our town, uttering fanatical cries and making processions, nearly naked. See Parl. Papers, No. 33.

honourable exceptions, invariably either connived at, or openly encouraged, the carnage and spoliation; so that, while the latter of the highest rank were brought to justice in considerable numbers, not one of the Druse Chiefs who took a leading part in the massacre, up to this hour, has been punished.

The recent massacres in Syria, I have good grounds for believing, were thus got up in Constantinople by the old fanatic party, who are still all-powerful in that city, and are countenanced and encouraged in their fanaticism, and their proceedings against Christians, by Abdul Azis, the brother of the late Sultan Abdul Medjid. In the month of August last I was in Egypt, a few months only after the Syrian massacres, and received much valuable information in relation to them from a French ecclesiastic at Alexandria—the head of a religious order, a gentleman of considerable eminence, remarkable for his attainments, and of the highest order of intelligence, who was, in virtue of his office, in communication with all the French clergy then on the mission in Syria, and, to my knowledge, in daily intercourse with the fugitives from Syria, who had fled during the massacres into Egypt, and were still remaining there. To that gentleman, who was in close communication, too, with the consular authorities of his nation in Syria, who had been there immediately before the outbreak of the Druses, and was cognisant of the mischievous designs that were then contemplated by the Druses, and the efforts that were then being made by the French Consul-general of Syria, in concert with the chief ecclesiastical authorities of the Maronites, to defeat them, I am largely indebted for authentic information on this subject. To the Superior of the Lazarist order in Alexandria I am likewise indebted for reliable information on the subject, which came directly from the scenes of those terrible atrocities, where the members of this order were on the mission, as, in point of fact, they are throughout the whole country.

Intimately acquainted as I was of old with that country, and the different races of it, that were then the subjects of my

inquiry, I was enabled to deal advantageously, I think, with the details then given me; and by other persons, subsequently, not of the clerical profession, nor of strong sympathies with the Maronites or their missionaries—by Englishmen who had been in Syria during the massacres, and had only recently left its shores. Every traveller, at least, must be aware there is no amount of knowledge to be gained from books, or got from verbal accounts given of scenes that have been witnessed by others, and of events that have occurred, which a previous knowledge of the place and people with which they are connected, will not enable one to form a juster estimate of, and a clearer conception of what ought to be received with caution, or required confirmation, or ought to be rejected altogether.

I have taken no small pains, both in France and England, since my return from the Levant, to put myself in possession of all official information, and likewise private communications giving all the reliable accounts of those deplorable transactions, that were procurable; and the results of these efforts will be found in the following pages. At the close of my literary career, I ardently desire, in this last work of mine, it may be found I have not been unfaithful to the interests of humanity in treating of Turkish atrocities, and massacres of Christians at the hands of Druses, which have met with apologists in high places; and have not allowed my judgment to be swayed by any influences, however high or popular.

One of my informants in my last visit to the East, in 1860, concerning the Syrian massacres, in whose statements I place full confidence, gave me to understand the origin of them had been clearly traced to his knowledge to the old fanatic Turkish party at Constantinople. By them a conspiracy was formed, the object of which was the extirpation of the Christians in the provinces, in the first instance. The brother of the Sultan was cognizant of this project. It was a part of a conspiracy on a great scale against the Giaours of the Turkish Empire. One of the great results expected from it was the calling into being such zeal for the cause of Islam throughout the provinces as would

inflame the hearts of true believers, and stir them up to wage a holy war against the existing reforming government.

On one occasion my informant was a guest of a wealthy Moslem merchant, at a déjeuner given by him some years ago, at Stamboul, in a kiosk in a beautiful garden in the vicinity of the Bosphorus, at which the present Sultan was also a guest. There were some Levantine Christians also at this entertainment, who had country houses in the vicinity of this hospitable merchant. After the repast the young Turkish prince walked with some of his Turkish friends to a part of the garden where poppies were grown in abundance. My informant's attention was drawn to this place by loud shouts of laughter, and, on reaching the spot, he found the hopeful heir to the Turkish throne, with his scymitar drawn, in the act of cutting down poppy heads "en masse," and showing the spectators, jocularly, how he would mow down the heads of Giaours, if he had as many thousands of them before him as there were poppies there to be swept off.

When the fanatics of Stamboul need the services of the dervishes for stirring up the embers of fanaticism, which, according to their notions of the requirements of the law of Islam, may have too long smouldered, crowds are collected in the vicinity of the principal mosques and harangued by the wily members of the confraternity of sanctimonious libertines, the profligate devotees, half saints, half maniacs, entire mountebanks; mockers of sacred things, and almost as irreverent in holy places, as Spanish and Italian sacristans—the dervishes of all religious orders.

The crowds have it dinged into their ears that the faith is in danger, the Koran is set at nought, trampled on by the giaours. The time is come for making war on the infidels—a holy war in defence of religion against the dogs of Christians! If the people are not sufficiently excited, a quarter of the city is burned down, and all the purposes are answered which the appearance of several leading articles, of more than ordinary

vehemence and vigour, in a great organ of public opinion would occasion in Europe.

And, finally, if a massacre is to be got up in Syria, a number of dervishes are dispatched to the various districts, where the conflicting influences of French, English and Russian consuls, and the widely separated interests and bitter contentions, and spiteful sectarian controversies of Protestant and Catholic missionaries, have produced the greatest rancour between Christians of different communities, or the deadliest animosity has been excited between Maronites and Druses.

It is complimentary to Turkish policy to find that Christian policy, in some countries peculiarly pure and perfect, and whose people are particularly jealous of their character for civilization, is indebted to the former largely for a discovery in the art of retaining power in provinces occupied rather than governed by their possessors. Maundrell, whose "Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, A.D. 1697," was published upwards of a century and a half ago, states that when he was travelling in Syria he encountered difficulties, and he tells us "They were caused by the embroylments and factions that were amongst the Arabs, which made us as desirous as possible to keep out of their way. 'Tis the policy of the Turks always to sow divisions amongst these wild people, by setting up several heads over their tribes, after deposing the old and placing new ones in their stead. *By which art they create contrary interests and parties amongst them*, preventing them from ever uniting under any one leader, which if they would have the sence to do (being so numerous, and almost the sole inhabitants thereabouts), they might shake off this Turkish yoke, and make themselves supreme lords of the country." *

Nothing in the way of recklessness of assertion can be more astounding than the solemn statements we read in the Parliamentary reports of the decline of fanaticism in Turkey; of the efficacy of the reforms of late years for the protection of the

* Maundrell's "Journey from Aleppo," 5th ed., p. 56.

Christian subjects of the Sultan; of the sufficiency of the power, and the sincerity of the intentions, of Turkish officials for the prevention of all persecution, and the punishment of any oppression at the hands of Moslems, or their ever-ready accomplices and partisans in schemes of wholesale murder and spoliation—the Druses. Let us see how these bold assertions of the champions and advocates of Turkish rule, and the protectors of its rapidly growing civilization are borne out by recent travellers in the Turkish dominions.

Some years previously to the recent massacres, the Hon. F. Walpole, in his "Travels in the Further East, the Ansayrii and the Assassins," gave a graphic account of the atrocities of Turkish rule in that part of Syria which he had visited.

"It may not be out of the way here to enter into the subject of the estimation in which this persecuted race is held, both by Turks and Christians. The Turks regard those who believe the Bible and Holy Writ as Giaours (Kafirs), perhaps infidels. This is the name used, the one word being Turkish, the other Arab; but all other sects they call Immamee, or without religion. The Christians, &c., probably are as little loved as the others, but they are now strong; as for 'these Immamee, these Ansayrii, it is better to kill one than to pray a whole day.' . . . .

"There can be no worse government than that of the Turks, for the delicate task of appeasing an excitable people. They can kill, massacre, destroy, pillage, rob, lie, and abuse to perfection; but as to assuaging the temper of the beaten, distracting their thoughts, reviving their spirits, conciliating or helping, such a thing is utterly incompatible with their natures. The Pacha sits in his serrai; he can never hear the truth; and, as among them from first to last, money is the sole object—to obtain that to-day, they would leave burning a light that would blow them up to-morrow!!

"A Christian and Mahometan prophecy had named the day next following the one after my arrival as that on which a rising was to take place. As the eve approached the fears

of the poor Christians were terrible. It seemed incredible that men could be such cowards; resistance was a word undreamt of in their utmost fancies. One or two young men were said to have died of fright. Yet they had foreseen this for weeks, had money to purchase arms, which were plentiful in the shops, had houses, natural fortresses. When spoken to, they regarded me with wonder. 'It is no use; for us there is no hope.' 'What!' I replied, 'are you men? Will you see your wives, your daughters, violated, your sons murdered, and not strike one blow?' They gazed, and passed on. May we not look at this as a great principal cause whereby five thousand Mussulmans were enabled to conquer this populous country, then overflowing with wealth? Their church also inculcated a passiveness, a submission, that has done more injury to them than all the swords and oppressions of the Turks. They must not boldly resist, bravely struggle, and die; but they may lie, fawn, creep, sneak, prevaricate and abuse."

In the Latakia district, where the people are more industrious, the Hon. Mr. Walpole says, the oppression of the Government is most severe. No portion of the Sultan's dominions was apparently more misgoverned. Tyranny and oppression, the law of the strong, and nowhere is there more oppression. The milder rule spreading elsewhere is here unknown. Murders are of daily occurrence: robbery perpetual, under such circumstances it may be well believed."

Be it observed that Mr. Walpole speaks of reformed Turkish government in this district of Latakia in the year 1851, when the famous charter of Turkish liberty, justice and protection for all subjects of the Sultan, the Tanzimat, was in existence on paper, the original locked up in the Royal Treasury in the same chamber with the old black woollen garment of the Prophet Mohammed.

"It would occupy too long a space (says Mr. Walpole) to relate the differences existing amongst the sects in the East, and I must refer the reader to Gibbon or to Robertson. The hatred of one sect for the other is an increasing feeling, fos-

tered by ignorance and passion. At present all hope of a change is faint, and we must leave it in the hands of God, using our best efforts to second the good work a few humble men have taken in hand.

"In fine the traveller will find, with surprise, the hate and rancour existing between the sects; and that the Christians have more love and charity for the Mussulman or idolator, than they have for the Christian of another sect; and he will hear blasphemies uttered against things he holds sacred, because they are regarded either a hair's breadth more or less by another."*

The testimony of Mr. Walpole is borne to the fanaticism of the Turks of Damascus—"The Turks of Damascus, so famed for their fanaticism, but late acts of the Consuls had conciliated them."

And this fanaticism we find ascribed to the fidelity of their religious principles:—"Many old and fine families of Mussulmans reside there, and also there is, what elsewhere in the Ottoman dominions has no existence, an hereditary Saracenic nobility—families descendant from the conquerors—collateral descendants of Abou Bekr and others, who for years have given Pashas to the empire."

Aleppo is hardly inferior in its fanaticism to Damascus.

Mr. Walpole tells us:—"Its plains and wells have drunk deeply of blood. It has heard that dreadful cry, 'Allah Akbar, Allah Akbar, Alamlah, Alamlah, Aljannah, Aljannah!" God is great, God is great; fight, fight; Paradise, Paradise! And recent events teach us that the sound still lurks in the throats of the Turks. A word will bring it forth, and then they will spring on the Christian, hateful, ferocious, savage, as of yore. Well then can we understand how proud was Othello's boast, when in fair Venice's palmy days—

> "In Aleppo once,
> Where a malignant and a turbaned Turk,
> Beat a Venetian, and traduced the state,
> I took by the throat the circumcised dog,
> And smote him."†

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol 1, p. 401.
† Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. 1, p. 229.

The sword of Islam is the sword of salvation and damnation, the key that opens the door of death, conducting Mahommed to heaven, Christians, Jews and all other infidels to hell. The Koran tells its true believers—"A drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night passed in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and of prayer."

M. Blanqui, a member of the Institute of France, in 1843 published his "Voyage en Bulgarie, Pendant l'Année 1841," in which he has given an account of the massacres committed by the Turks on the Christian inhabitants in that country a short time previous to his travels in it.

The frightful details of carnage and pillage carried into execution so recently by Turkish troops with entire impunity; nay, even with the connivance of the authorities, shews but too plainly that Turkish fanaticism is as formidable to the Christian communities of Turkey as it ever was.

The wholesale massacres of Christian Rayahs, subjects of the Ottoman Empire in the Pachalisks of Mosul and Bagdad and the territory between the shores of the Persian Gulph and of the Euxine, even during the reign of the late Sultan, have been noticed in the works of Bishop Southgate, Longworth, Layard, and MacFarlane. The unhappy Nestorian Christians, who dwell in the vicinity of the Mussulman Kurds were the chief sufferers in these recent massacres.

Two of these massacres are attributed to not only the connivance at, but the active impulse given to the fanaticism of the murderous Kurds, over whom he ruled. The first massacre was perpetrated with impunity.

The second, in 1846, called forth a show of dissapprobation at Stamboul. Reschid Pascha, then Grand Vizier, sent an Imperial commissioner, Nazim Effendi to enquire into the circumstances of Bedr-Khan's renewed atrocities.

No sooner did he reach Mosul than he had an interview with the sanguinary monster, and the result of that interview was, the Commissioner was bribed "with large sums of money and would receive no evidence against him." The Commissioner had conferences with the French and English Consuls on the

subject of the late massacre of the Nestorian Christians, and the reply we are told to their complaints by the Commissioners was "as false as it was savage." I have read a reply of a recent date, given by a statesman in the British House of Commons, to the complaints that were forced on his attention of a massacre of Roman Catholic Christians committed in Syria by the Druses, with the connivance of the Turkish authorities, and the answer given to those complaints was precisely similar in its character to that which MacFarlane has justly stigmatised as being "as false as it was savage."

"Far from seeking (says MacFarlane) to deny or palliate the atrocious circumstances of the massacre, the Turkish Commissioner, Nazim Effendi, openly justified them, and said that the Nestorians were rebellious infidels, whom it was the duty of all religious Mussulmans to exterminate: and when asked what provocation had been given by these poor Christians, he repeated an absurd story which had been trumped up by Bedr-Khan-Bey, in justification of the first great massacre he had perpetrated three years ago, and in which 10,000 of the Nestorians had perished: the story that some green turbaned Turks, Emirs, settlers in the neighbourhood of the Christians, had been murdered by them. There was not a word of truth in the original statement."

Some Moslem peasants who had intruded on the territory of the Nestorians, were, on the complaint of the Christians, removed by the Pacha of Mosul to another part of the country; and on their retiring it was maliciously said that the green turbaned Moslems had been assassinated. Upon this flimsy foundation, Nazim Effendi had the audacity to assert that Bedr-Khan-Bey was justified in his indiscriminate massacre of 2,000 more Christian subjects of the Sultan Abdul Medjid.

"Not a Mussulman had been killed by the Nestorians (said the Consuls), the men reported to be dead are living, and in good health not far off."

But even admitting that murders had been committed by

the Christians, ought not some distinction be made between the innocent and the guilty? Ought not the women and children of the Nestorians at least to have been spared?

The Imperial Commissioner, Nazim Effendi only replied that they (the Nestorians) were all infidels—all the same dirt, and deservedly consigned to the same fate.

MacFarlane adds—"I state these particulars on the authority of a friend, who is also the friend of Mr. Layard, and was then, as well as Mr. Layard, in the country at the time of Nazim Effendi's visit."*

One of the notable Turkish massacres of modern times, since the much vaunted reform of Ottoman Government, which M. Blanqui refers to, was perpetrated in Bulgaria on the Christian Rayahs of that province by an army of 7,000 savage Arnaout soldiery, let loose on them by Mustapha Pacha in 1843.

This massacre was the result of an unsuccessful effort of an abortive insurrection of the Christians in a mountainous district, in which some Turkish soldiers (cavalry) had been defeated and slain. M. Blanqui visited the scene of these horrors in August, 1841, when he says he found bands of wild Arnaouts, who had ravaged the country with fire and sword, still lingering in various places, and the plains of Nissa and Jopha, militarily occupied by more than 20,000 men of the Sultan's (so called) regular army, with a numerous artillery. Here and there he saw houses burned, fruit trees torn up by the roots and women and children wandering about the woods and wasted fields. In one district there was nothing but terror and traces of devastation. The peasants said, "Give us arms; if we had but arms we would soon drive these wild beasts out of the woods."

"The insurrection (says M. Blanqui) was suppressed, but terror reigned in all hearts. One must have seen the sombre despair of the Bulgarian peasants, and the insolence of the Albanian hordes, to form an idea of what this Christian popu-

* Turkey and its Destiny, vol. 2, p. 57.

lation must have suffered during this short and sad period. Europe, which takes so lively an interest in the Arican negroes, is not sufficiently aware that there exists at her gates, or as one may say in her bosom, some millions of men, Christians like ourselves, who are treated as dogs in their quality of Christians, under a Government to which all Christian powers send Christian ambassadors."

Well may M. Blanqui say, the Hatti Scheriffe of Gul-Hana has been "*an atrocious deception.*"

The recent massacres in Syria now claim our attention.

The events which recently purpled the soil of Syria did not break out suddenly.

European agents, secret and public, were the immediate promoters of them; but for two years previously the Turks openly prepared these results. The Turkish officials of the Porte in Syria left no efforts untried to revive all the old differences between the Druses and the Maronites. They excited some of the most hot-headed of the latter against the Druses, and persuaded them that circumstances were favourable to make war on the enemies of their faith; while, on the other hand, they urged on the common enemy of Christians and Mohammedans to profit by their military superiority to crush the worshippers of Christ, and to enrich themselves by plunder.

These animosities and hostilities, which had for a long time been in preparation and course of encouragement, broke out vehemently and of a sudden, *apparently*, in the early part of June, 1860.

But a year previously there had been contentions and conflicts between them.

On the 15th of August, 1859, a quarrel about a sheep became the pretext of a furious battle between the Druses and the Maronite Christians, which terminated in the complete conflagration of the mixt village of Beit-meri, where these disturbances had taken place. At one time it was feared that the two parties, who divide between them the Lebanon, would

rise en masse against the other, and renew the war of 1845. But the prompt and energetic measures of the Consuls on that occasion put a stop to hostilities. Besides, it appeared that the Turks did not then find things yet ripe for the execution of their plans, and feared that in rising too soon that they would only miscarry. In effect, Kourchid Pacha, Governor-general of Beyrout, of whose infamous conduct in the recent tragedies of 1860 we have heard so much, displayed, in 1859, the greatest activity in putting down the conflict in which the two parties were engaged. This conflict, however, served him as a pretext for establishing, for some months, a camp of Turkish troops at Djounih, in the very heart of Kesraouan. In the Turkish camp there were active and energetic fanatic emissaries of the anti-Christian Ulema party of Constantinople, who penetrated into the Christian districts of the Lebanon, secretly, and excited the Maronite peasants against the Emirs, and completed the disorganisation of the Christian districts by inciting them against their rulers and their enemies, and creating a spirit of tumult and disorder.

The winter of 1859 thus passed on without effecting anything but a great agitation throughout all parts of the Lebanon, and a feeling of consternation and apprehension of danger at the hands of the Druses. On all sides they prepared themselves for a struggle that was imminent, and some of the Maronite merchants and capitalists of Beyrout, who acted as bankers and agents to their co-religionists, used their last endeavours to procure and distribute in the Christian portion of the mountains, muskets and ammunition, to put the population, who had been almost entirely disarmed since the events of 1845, in a state to defend themselves, in case of any aggression on the part of the Druses.

In fine, in the latter part of the spring of 1860, the Mussulman organizers of the affair, and their abettors among the enemies of the Maronites, judged the moment had arrived for the explosion of their foul conspiracy. Kassim-Bey, a Druse sheik in the service of Saïd-Bey-Djemblat, one of the protegés

of the English missionaries, and one of the most influential chiefs of the Druse district, came and established himself close to Sayda, followed by some Druses and Mussulmans of Aglin-el-Arkoub. Emissaries of other Druse chiefs did the same thing near Beyrout.

On the 26th of April, Kassim-Bey came to the city, and had with the *Mudir*, or governor, of Sayda a long interview, of which nothing ever transpired. The following day, a great agitation among the Mussulman population was observed. They procured arms in the town, at any price. The same day, the 27th of April, three Christians of the village of Katouli were assassinated by the Druses of the suite of Kassim Bey.

From that time not a day passed that some isolated Christian was not murdered in one or other of the Druse districts. The most talked-of of these assassinations was that of a Maronite priest.

Nevertheless it was still hoped by the well-disposed that events would at least retard the breaking out of any further disturbances till the end of winter, and that might, perhaps, be able to ward them off altogether. In fact, the time was approaching for gathering in the silk, and, as any interruption to the harvest causes an equal injury to the Druses and Maronites, ordinarily, even in the most bitter wars, all hostility ceases at that period.

But this hope was very soon dispelled. The 14th of May an engagement between the two rival populations took place in the environs of Sayda. The Christians of Katouli, assailed by the Druses, defended themselves with their guns, killed two of the aggressors and wounded a third. This resistance was only a stimulus for further excesses on the part of the Druses. The secret interviews of Kassim-Bey and the *Mudir* of Sayda became more and more frequent. Encamped at the gate of the town, Kassim-Bey made his own men search all the Christians who went out, took away their arms and ammunition, only allowing the Turks and the Druses to go in and

out freely, to arm themselves, and provide themselves with powder and bullets.

Assassinations multiplied fast. The 18th of May, at the sequel of a quarrel between a Christian and a Mussulman of El Arkoub, the latter was wounded by the cut of a knife. The Christian was arrested, but that did not suffice for Kassim-Bey and those for whom he was agent. He took the wounded Mussulman, and had him transported to the town of Sayda, followed by some hundreds of Druses, crying out to the Mussulmans that it was a dog of a Christian who had wounded one of their people, and that they must be revenged. They hoped, in all probability, to bring about by that means an immediate rising of the Mussulman population, and thus effect a massacre of the Christians; but, by the intervention of some influential and energetic persons, the danger was averted, and this diabolical project only had the effect of augmenting the excitement of the Mussulman population.

While things were in this alarming state at Sayda and its environs, the situation of the districts around Beyrout was sufficiently grave. The state of affairs in the town itself soon became so menacing that, on the 20th of May, the principal merchants of Beyrout met in one of the rooms of the Ottoman Bank, and signed a petition, addressed to the Consuls of the different Powers, praying them to interest themselves with the Pacha to adopt prompt and effective measures, with the view of maintaining the safety of the city and the peace of the mountain, as absolutely necessary for the continuance of commercial transactions.

Two days after, a slight action took place on the borders of Nahar-Beyrout—one might almost say at the very gates of the city. Ten or twelve Druse peasants came in search of some of their people employed in the spinning manufactory near the river, to take them up to the mountain. They met some Christians, armed like themselves. First words, then insults, were exchanged on each side, and from insulting language they came to blows. A fire of musketry was employed,

in which it is acknowledged by persons friendly to the Maronites, the first shots were fired by the Christians. The Druses intrenched themselves in a house, where they were assailed; and when this bloody conflict terminated, one Druse was stretched dead on the floor, and two others seriously wounded, as also one Christian, who was immediately carried to the hospital of the French Sisters of Charity.

This fray, or battle, as it was called, at Nahar-Beyrout, added to the circumstance that, when hostilities became more serious, the first house set on fire at Beit-Meri, in the midst of the firing, was the house of a Druse, caused many persons in Beyrout to be told, that although the Christians were without doubt terrible sufferers subsequently at the hands of the Druses, the fault was their own, and that they had drawn upon themselves this misfortune, by having first attacked the Druses, who were not thinking of making war on them, and had no idea of molesting them. Nothing is more unfounded than this opinion, and nothing more untrue than the statement that the Druses had entered into no conspiracy against the the Christians, nor had not overtly acted against them. The statement is sufficiently refuted by the facts which persons on the spot, and who had been cognizant of those occurrences from first to last have related.

The writer on the recent massacres in Syria, whose account of their origin, progress, and results, is most worthy of credit, is Monsieur F. Lenormant, an eye-witness of many of the catastrophes he has so accurately described in his excellent narrative, "Les Dernieres Evenements en Syrie," has made some excellent observations on this subject which I would commend and recommend to the careful attention and dispassionate consideration of any statesmen and politicians whose sympathies, unfortunately, on this occasion, are not on the side of the oppressed, but of those by whom humanity has been outraged; not on the side of the Christians who have been massacred, but of the enemies of Christianity, by whom a frightful carnage of Christians has been perpetrated; I would call the attention

to those statements of persons whose first concern in this instance, is not for the interests of civilisation, but for the character and prestige of a government so rotten, and steeped in corruption as this Turkish regime, which in the words of Macchiavelli, "Puzzo nell' naso dell Europa."

"The question (says Monsieur Lenormant) is very immaterial whether it was a Maronite or a Druse who fired the first shot. The person who should be responsible for the consequences is not the one who does the first act, but he who has taken time in preparing and provoking it. When it is the government, when they have the disposal of material force, of money, and a thousand other means of intrigue, it is always easy when a war or an insurrection breaks out, to make those whom they wish to crush commence the struggle, and thus to make themselves appear in the wrong. But an impartial observer must not allow himself to be caught by this snare, and from beneath the mask of hypocrisy he must expose the truly guilty.

Thus, even though we admit that there was not sufficient provocation for the assassinations committed in Metri and around Sayda; even though one would not wish to see an opening of hostilities in the rash enterprise of Katouli where the Druses had been the aggressors, nor even in the scuffle of Nahar-Beyrout, where the first blows were struck by the Christians; it must not necessarily follow that the first fault of it should be thrown back upon the Maronites. In fact, the true guilty party, the only instigator of the late events in Syria, he who prepared everything for the last two years, was neither the Maronite people, nor yet the Druse people, it was the Turkish authorities themselves, the agents of the Porte, the Pacha of Beyrout, and *perhaps even a still higher power.*[*]

Moreover, the culpability of the Turkish authorities will be more evidently set forth in the subsequent events. The real culprit alluded to in the concluding observations of Monsieur Lenormant, and spoken of mysteriously, as "perhaps even a

[*] Lenormant's "Les Dernieres Evenements de Syrie. Par. 1860. p. 22.

higher power," than the Pacha of Beyrout, or any other Ottoman authority in Syria, though not named, I have good reason to believe *is no less a personage than Abdul Medjid the brother of the then Sultan.*

Monsieur le Comte de Vogue, in his account of the Syrian massacres, "Les Evenements de Syrie," referring to the origin of the disturbances, says, that "For two years previously to the outbreak (in May, 1860), a silent agitation prevailed in the Lebanon. To the ordinary vexations which the Maronites experienced at the hands of the Druses, secretly instigated by the Turks, a new cause of excitement was added. Opinions adverse to the government began to extend over the mountain, not only the Christian sheiks had driven away the Kaimakam officer set over them by the government (Beschir-Abou-Ellameh), but even the Maronite peasantry rose against their sheiks, refused to acknowledge their authority, and gave themselves up to all kinds of disorders.

The Emirs had been plundered, and driven from their castles; a farrier, the leader of the insurrection, had taken the title of Bey; and that organization, which until then had been the strength of the mountain, was now threatened with complete dissolution. The Maronite clergy have been reproached with having encouraged this revolt, and excited the people against their masters, with the view of lessening their authority to their own advantage. This accusation is exaggerated, and the result has done them justice: the clergy, in allowing this agitation to go on, believed themselves destined to succeed to the inheritance of the political influence of the deposed sheiks. The instigation emanated from higher quarters.

It is now very clear that they proceeded from the Turkish Government who preceded the massacre by intriguing, and dividing the population with the object of crushing them more easily.

Dieu veuille que les agents Anglais aient été etrangers á ces machinations, et que, volontairement ou non, ils n'aient pas

servi d'instruments au plus infâme des gouvernements contre la plus noble des causes !

Whilst the Maronites, yielding to these culpable instigations were thus working their own ruin, the Druses, the objects of the complacency of the Ottoman authorities, drew their ranks closer, and strengthened the feudal bonds which attached them to the ancient families of their Emirs, to Dymblat, to Nakad, to Hamadê. Under these circumstances the war broke out, but from the very first it was easy to foretell what would be its issue ; on the one side, a brave people, but without arms, without chiefs, without organization ; on the other side, warlike tribes perfectly armed, led on by chiefs habituated to command them, possessed by religious fanaticism, and openly sustained by the agents of the highest authority.

The hostilities commenced at the end of 1859, and were continued for some time without marked advantage being gained on either side ; this first struggle did not assume a formidable aspect, and the intervention of the consuls put an end to it. It was confined to some musket shots, and some houses burnt, about Beit Meri and in Metri. The peace was not of long duration, the assassinations increased, sinister rumours circulated, the attitude of the Mussulmans in the towns became threatening ; bands of Druses were seen each day coming to Beirout, and the other seaport towns to supply themselves with arms and ammunition ; all announced that a terrible explosion was imminent.

The consuls, at this juncture, made representations to Kourschid Pacha, who made fair promises and kept none of them. They addressed themselves to the Druse chiefs who had the principal influence in the mixed districts and particularly to Said Bey Djemblad (one of the principal instigators of the massacres of the Maronites, subsequently tried, convicted, and sentenced to death, but pardoned in consequence of the interference on his behalf of the British ambassador at the Porte, Sir Henry Bulwer), to Abou Nakad, to Bechir Bey and to

Sheik Hamade. These chiefs replied in pacific terms to the messengers sent to them, and declared the Christians had nothing too fear from them. Nevertheless, the preparations "for war" went on amongst them, and several skirmishes took place in the vicinity of Deir-el-Kamar, and on the plain of Rahhè.

The Maronites saw the necessity of assuming a defensive attitude, after various individual murders of their people in different localities, and wrecking of isolated houses of Christians, not only at the commencement, but in the progress of this persecution, very like what took place at the hands of Orangemen in the north of Ireland, some sixty-four years ago. At this juncture it was that Kourshid Pacha, under pretext of pacification and interposition, in the interests of humanity, between the combatants, took his departure from Beyrout, the 29th May, 1860, with about a thousand men, and encamped near Baabda, about seven miles distance from the town at the entrance to the defiles of the mountain.

It is the custom when the Mushir sets out on any military expedition, that salutes are fired from the batteries of the castle. The salute on the present occasion, was the pre-concerted signal of the Mushir and the Druse chiefs, for an onslaught on the Christians of all the neighbouring towns and villages. At the sound of the discharge of the first cannon, fires were lighted on the heights in all the adjoining districts inhabited by Druses; the houses of the Christians of Beit-Meri were soon after surrounded and ransacked (the inmates having fled in terror at the approach of the Druses and their Turkish allies), and set on fire, and in a short time the line of mountains which forms the background of Beirout, was lit up at intervals not widely separated, with the flames of the houses of the Christian population of that part of the Lebanon.

At Meten all the adjacent villages and detached houses of the Christians were assailed by the Druse and Turk wreckers and murderers, but in this district they were stoutly resisted and repulsed, and driven back to Ras-El-Meten, of which district

several Druse villages were sacked and burned by the Maronites, in reprisal for the previous wrecking and burning, of Christian villages by the Druses.

While these occurrences were taking place, Kourschid Pacha let loose the most ferocious of his soldiers, the Bashi-Bazouks, on the Maronites. The latter, in their astonishment and confusion at this unexpected attack of the Turkish force, avowedly in the field for their protection, fled in all directions, and in their flight numbers of them were cut down by their assailants. Then commenced the indiscriminate massacre of all Christians, not only in this district, but in the adjacent localities. The wrecking of houses and plundering of them, the slaughter of old and young, carrying away into slavery of the women who were young, became general wherever Turkish soldiers were in the localities that were the scenes of those disorders, they aided and abetted the Druses in their work of carnage and depredation.

Kourschid Pacha had taken effectual measures to prevent the Maronites of the southern districts of the Lebanon from receiving any succour from the more resolute and warlike Christians of their race, of the northern districts. He had pitched his camp in the immediate vicinity of the route which connects Meten with Kesrouan.

The Turkish authorities could have easily maintained tranquillity, after the collision between the Druses and Maronites, at Nahar Beyrout, on the 22nd of May, 1860, if they had desired to have done so. But they took no measures whatsoever to preserve order, and on the day following that collision, a Maronite was murdered with entire impunity at Dair-el-Kamar by the Druses. The infamous governor of Beyrout indeed at this period was taking measures for the accomplishment in his province, of the Constantinopolitan conspiracy against the Christians.

He then had only 750 of the Nizam troops, or regular infantry, at his disposal, but he dispatched messengers to Damascus, Naplous, and Jerusalem, for reinforcements, and from all the

adjacent districts he collected a horde of undisciplined, ferocious mercenaries, differently armed and accoutred, Bashi-Bazouks, Arnaouts, or Albanians, Turks of Tripoli, and Bedouins of the Nomade tribes of the uncultivated plains of the Bekhâa. These constituted the principal part of the forces with which Kourschid Pacha proceeded from Beyrout on the 29th of May, 1860, and encamped at about two hours' distance near the village of Baabda.

This strange proceeding of Kourschid Pacha, soon ceased to be so unaccountable as it appeared at first to be, both to the Christian inhabitants of Beirout, and of the Lebanon. Subsequent events plainly proved his object was to withdraw himself from the importunities of the consuls, and to put himself in a direct and commodious position for relations with the Druses.

The very day that Kourchid Pasha encamped at Baabda, on the 29th of May, the first serious conflict took place between the Druses and the Maronites. The two parties from noon to midnight maintained a murderous though desultory warfare, assailing one another in the streets and in their houses, shooting indiscriminately each other's families.

In the burning of houses those of the Christians which were first destroyed, were set fire to by a troop of the Albanian irregular soldiers, thirty or forty in number, who were posted in the unfortunate village of Beit Meri for the protection of the inhabitants.

When the village was a heap of ruins the two parties fled about midnight in different directions: the Christians proceeded to Ain-Sadee, the residence of the Maronite Bishop Tobias, and the Druses repaired to Abadiyeh, their headquarters.

It was while the conflict was going on at Beit Meri that the Druses of Meten burned the Christian quarter of the village of Arsoun—the Maronite villages also of Keneisch and Zendouka and some other hamlets thinly inhabited. After these exploits, the triumphant Druses fell back on the locality of Ras-el-Meten, where their principal strength is in point of population.

On the 30th, the Druse devastations extended all around Beyrout. The whole country surrounding the place where Kourschid Pacha had so strangely encamped: the Maronite villages of Baabda, Areya, El Hadeth, Kefr Sshima, and seven others were wrecked and burned. One might have imagined they were witnessing a wrecking scene performed in Ireland: a fourth of July fusilade of Romanists at the hands of Armagh Orangemen.

Wherever there was a wrecking and a burning of houses, and a carnage of Christians, the Turkish Baschi Bazouks, who formed part of the Pachas troops encamped near Baabda, were sure to be seen mingling with the Druses and lending willing hands in the work of death and devastation.

The savagery of these ferocious soldiers of the Governor of Beyrout was such that even the Druses, with whom they were leagued, on some occasions expressed disgust at their horrible acts of cruelty—acts of unparalleled atrocity except at the hands of Turkish soldiers on Christian enemies.

Generally speaking the Druses spared women and very young children throughout the whole period of the massacres, but neither women nor children of any age or of either sex, were spared by the Turkish soldiers.

The Baschi Bazouks in particular, distinguished themselves by the horrible outrages they perpetrated, not only in mangling their victims, but in violating the very women they subsequently murdered, and grasping little children by a leg or an arm, and then slashing at their bodies with their yaticans, till the little creatures were literally cut to pieces.

So much for the Turkish soldiers who are the champions of the fanaticism of the Ottoman Empire.

As for the governor Khourchid, far from interposing to arrest the burnings and massacres, far from endeavouring to restrain his soldiers, or to march against them the regular troops he had to dispose of, he remained quietly seated at the door of his tent, gravely smoking his pipe and looking on at the burning of the christian villages. That of Baabda was pillaged and

destroyed at not more than a distance of two lengths of the sword from his very tent, without his moving from his state of impassibility. He did not confine himself to that; he encouraged by gesture and voice, in treating the destroyers as heroes and defenders of the true faith. However, at the close of the day, he made a sort of pretended demonstration of his impartiality and energy in the work of re-establishing peace.

Therein consisted the demonstration. Two shots of cannon *with powder*, were fired upon a party of Druses who were near camp, and several shots of cannon of *case shot*, were fired upon a troop of 500 Christians, who came from a neighbouring town under the command of a certain Toussoun-Schein, to the succour of their brethren who were attacked.

In effect, the Maronites made a vigorous resistance, though far worse armed and organized than their aggressors. On many points even they had the upper hand. The Christians of Meten, recovered from the first surprise that the attack of the city had occasioned them, repulsed the Druses, and in their turn assuming the part of the offensive, set fire to that portion of the non-christian village of Arsoun as also to that of Bzibdin and Kournayil.

The same day, the large and beautiful christian village of Hammanan was assailed by a strong party of Druses. Many of the inhabitants took flight, but about fifty men remained behind to defend their homes, and fought heroically for five consecutive hours. At length the Druses had reinforcements and remained masters of the village. The women and children who had not fled towards Beyrout, had found refuge in the French spinning manufactory, superintended by M. Bertrand. That establishment was spared. But in the same village was installed the administration of the works of a carriage roadway from Beyrout to Damascus, undertaken by a French company. The persons of the agents of this company were respected, and the effects of the manufactory were saved; but those of the engineer and of several other officers were pillaged, as well as the plans, estimates and business of the route, which they hastened to burn

as some witchcraft of the French. The house in which was installed the management of the roadway to Damascus, had hoisted the tricoloured standard as a signal for protection. The sight of this flag, so much respected up to this time, whose folds covered with inviolable protection whoever hoisted it, did not for a moment arrest the Druses, and after having been pillaged, the house that it surmounted was destroyed by fire. Interrogated about the difference of their conduct, relative to the establishment of M. Bertrand, and the house of the agents of the roadway to Damascus, the Druses replied that they received orders to spare the spinning manufactory but nothing else.

To close the scenes of the 30th of May, it now remains to speak of the fate of the inhabitants of El-Mouh-allakah-ed-Damour.

It is a village situated near the borders of the large river Damour, at the extreme south of the plain of Beyrout. The population, who were all Christians, had abandoned their homes from the early morning, and went to take shelter in Beyrout, confiding in the promises of the Pacha, when it was surrounded and assailed by the Druses and the Bashi-Bazouks, who there massacred an immense number of women and children, who, utterly terror stricken, allowed their throats to be cut without any resistance.

The day of the 31st of May witnessed the last efforts of any resistance of the Christians in the environs of Beyrout. They had had some success the previous day. But in order to maintain this good fortune it was necessary that the Christians of the districts where the fight had taken place should not remain unassisted.

They required the support of the population of the entire Christian districts, particularly that of the neighbours, the warlike inhabitants of Kesrouan, the terror of the Druses. Now, Khourchid Pacha, in establishing his camp at Baabda, found himself, by some chance, which appears singularly premeditated, to have intercepted the only route by which the people of Kesrouan could come to the succour of the Maronites

where the struggle had commenced. Moreover, in ordering the cannon to be fired on the eve upon the troop of Tousson-Scheïn, he had given a proof that if the warriors of Kesrouan advanced towards Meten, he would oppose their march by force.

Nevertheless on the morning of the 31st, a band of Christians came from all parts of Meten, and with a force of two or three hundred men, following up the offensive reprisal of the previous day by the Maronites, attacked the Druses in their principal quarter of Abâdêyeh. Unfortunately the elements of which this band was composed, had neither homogenity nor cohesion, and they lacked an able commander. The Druses, commanded by their Emirs, marched out from Abâdêyeh to the number of eight hundred, and burned eight or ten villages of the Lebanon in the vicinity of Beyrout. In one moment Deir-el-Kalaah, Ain-Bardé, Ain-Saadé, Broummana, Mar-Ischaya, Babdat, and Behannis became a prey to the flames. The entire mountain was covered with fire, and one heard resound in all directions detonations of shots. The village of Boumi alone in all that region opposed resistance sufficiently energetic and persevering to tire out the efforts of the Druses, aided by the Bashi-bazouks, and to preserve themselves from destruction.

A few minutes after, another troop of four or five hundred Druses sallied out from Ras-el-Meten, came down to the district of Meten, and set fire to every thing that was yet standing in the Christian villages and hamlets. Arbânîyeh, Dleïbir, Esch-Schouweïra, the Convent of Keneïseh, which had been spared the day before in the burning of the neighbouring village, were now destroyed from top to bottom. The same band passed at the foot of the French spinning manufactory of Aïn-Hamadé, under the direction of M. Mourgue; but in consequence of the orders given to respect establishments of that nature, the Druses did not attempt any violence against the spinning manufactory. They endeavoured, on the contrary, to reassure the

director: "Fear nothing," they cried out in passing by, "remain quietly at home, no one will trouble you."

The same day, the 31st, other bands of Druses and of Baschi-Bazouks spread themselves throughout the village of Hammana and Korreh, and reduced to ashes all the houses of the Christians. In a word, the Druse movement became more and more organized, and the destruction of the entire of the Maronite dwellings, as well as the massacre of the inhabitants was accomplished in a methodical manner throughout the whole districts of Meten and Ghourl, so that nothing escaped the hands of the destroyers. Nevertheless, in the midst of all this destruction, the spinning manufactory of M. M. Portalis, at Blathir, and that of a Greek, an ancient officer of the French marines, M. Veltakis, at El-Meteïn, were spared like those of Hammana and Aïn-Hamadé, and by the same orders. M. M. Portalis had even the courage, which cannot be too much praised, to open his spinning manufactory as a refuge for Christians who were driven from the environs; and, although seeing that, the most furious in the massacre amongst the Druses halted at the threshold of the door, without daring to go beyond, so precise were the orders they had received.

Within three days, sixty villages, rich and flourishing the day before, had been reduced to a heap of shapeless ruins.

Seeing the conduct of the Pacha, and aware also that a party of the Turkish troops had joined their enemies to attack them, the Christians of Meten and of Ghourl had lost all courage to defend themselves. Soon was to be seen a distracted crowd hurrying to Beyrout to seek refuge in the churches, in the consulates, and in private houses, the cut-throats pursuing them to the gates of the city.

The terror in Beyrout was general: people barricaded themselves in their houses, preparing for sustaining a siege. At night the terror was still greater.

There exists on the road to Damascus, near the gates of the city, a magnificent wood of pines, planted by the Emir Fakr-ed-

Din, a wood, to the description of which, M. Lamartine has consecrated several passages; it is called the Champs-Elysées, of Beyrout. "There, every day in time of peace, the people of the city resorted, on horseback or in carriages, to take the air. The Druses and the Baschi-Bazouks, continuing their exploits, came as far as this place, and there set fire to some houses. *

We read in a correspondence from Beyrout, dated 4th July, the following accounts of the frightful events which took place at Deir-el-Kammar :—

"Situated in the centre of a mixed district, in a strong position, Deir-el-Kammar was a rich and industrious city. At the end of the war in 1845, the administration of its affairs under a Druse *caimacan*, was abolished, the Druse placed under the authority of a direct Turkish governor, and at the beginning of the actual troubles, the Maronite inhabitants had manifested their intention not to take any part in them. The evening before the attack, the governor of Beyrout, Kourchid-Pacha, had written to felicitate them on their conduct, and to give them a formal assurance that he commanded the troops of the Sultan, who were in garrison at Beit-ed-din, to defend them against their enemies.

Friday, the 1st of June, 1860, about mid-day, whilst confiding in those promises, the people thought themselves in safety, the Druse Sheiks Abon Nacad, Amad-et-Hamadé, surrounded the Deir-el-Kammar with their contingents, and began the attack.

Taken by surprise and astonished to find that notwithstanding the assurances of the Muschir, the garrison, instead of repulsing the Druses, had retired to their barracks and had shut their doors, the inhabitants did not the less defend themselves with courage. The firing lasted till nine o'clock at night. The old men, the women, the children, and all those who were unable to fight, went to the palace of the governor and to the barracks to ask for asylum: but the soldiers refused to re-

* Les Derniers Evenements de Syrie. Par Francois Lenormant. Paris, 1860.

ceive them. Those only who could pay a considerable sum for the precarious hospitality, had been let in.

The following day, the Druses renewed the combat ; the principal men of the city at length went to the governor and to the commander of the troops, to implore of them either to give them assistance according to the orders of Kourchid-Pacha, or to supply them at least with arms, of which they stood in need to repel themselves the enemy.

They were told, that the soldiers could neither defend them, nor furnish them with arms, but that the authorities advised them to address themselves to Sayd-Bey-Djemblat, and likewise to Beschir-Bey-Abou-Macad, and to deliver up their arms to those two Sheiks. The Chiefs wrote at length to Sayd-Djemblat, who was at the time at Beteddin, with Abd-el-Salam-Bey, Turkish officer of the troops, a letter in which they made overtures of submission, and begging him to command the Druses to retire.

In reply to this letter, Sayd-Bey made the latter retire, but the following day, they returned, again surrounded the town, intercepted the roads that led to it, and massacred the inhabitants who attempted to leave it. The governor on his side, enjoined the inhabitants of Der-el-Kammar not to leave it, declaring that he would not be answerable for the consequences that might ensue to them if they infringed his orders.

At the same time the governor received in his palace with all possible honours the Sheiks Selim and Abou Nacad, who went there accompanied by a numerous suite of Druses.

On Sunday night the general of division, Taher Pacha, who was sent from Beyrout, arrived at Der-el-Kamer, with one hundred soldiers. The Druse chiefs preceded him and accompanied him to the seraglio.

There he had the chief men called before him, and assured them that the *Muschir*, knowing their devotion to the Porte and desirous to protect tham in a special manner, had sent to him to defend them against their enemies in case the latter should again attack them. After this declaration, he went to

Beteddin, and left the detachment he had taken with him at Der-el-Kammar.

The following day, Taher-Pacha had the chief men again called before him at Beteddin, and after having renewed the promises he had made the previous day, he demanded of them a written engagement to remain quietly at home, not to intermeddle with the affairs of the Lebanon, and not to circulate arms in the town. This document was immediately signed.

Tuesday, 5th June, Taher Pacha, returned from Bettedden to Der-el-Kammar; for the third time he assured the inhabitants of the good intentions of the Porte in their regard, and of its firm resolution not to allow the Druses again to attack them. Some days after a detachment of 500 soldiers arrived from Sagda to Der-el-Kammar with two howitzers from the country. He called together the officers, and in the presence of the chief men and of the troops recently arrived, he enjoined them to watch after the safety of the town, and to repulse the Druses by force if it were necessary, after which he returned to Beyrout.

The Druses nevertheless had not ceased to surround the town, preventing all communication from without, and pillaging all the provisions that were sent to the Christians.

The blockade was tightened after the departure of Taher Pacha. Three persons having left the city to gather some leaves of the grape in order to allay their hunger, were killed by the Druses. The Governor took advantage of this occasion to renew to the Christians the order not to quit the place.

This state of things continued until Wednesday, the 19th of June. The Druses then commenced to enter the town, armed and in small bands; they introduced themselves into the houses of the Christians under pretext of protecting them, whilst the governor traversed the streets accompanied by most of his officers, prevailing upon the inhabitants not to take up their arms. In the mean time the number of Druses augmented every instant, and they already filled the entire city, when the

trumpet was sounded, and all the soldiers were recalled to their barracks, of which they fastened the doors.

From that moment they never came out. Masters of Der-el-Kammar, the Druses, after having disarmed the Christians, began the pillage which continued all the night of the 19th to the 20th of June. From the morning, the Druses of the mixed districts arrived there to take part with their wives and their children, without the soldiers making the slightest effort to restrain them.

Massacre then succeeded to pillage; no one was spared; children were slaughted in their mother's lap, women and girls violated and ripped up in the sight of their husbands and fathers.

They cut down men in the streets with a blow of the hatchet, women were burnt after being bathed in the blood of their children, even the religious orders were not spared. The city was strewn with dead bodies, and the streets were weltering in blood. In the meantime about five hundred Christians had taken refuge with their families in the palace of the governor.

Excited by carnage, the Druses claimed the miserable victims, who were immediately delivered over to them. Those who had found a momentary asylum in the seraglio were driven out by the soldiers at the point of the bayonet. Two Christians who had taken refuge on the tops of the barracks were discovered by the Turks and precipitated into the streets.

At Beteddin, where a certain number of Christians had retired to beg an asylum from the soldiers the same scenes occurred; the unhappy people who had reckoned upon the promises which had been made so often and solemnly renewed, were mercilessly delivered over to the Druses, by those very persons who were commissioned to defend them. The Turkish officers of the troops Abdoul-Selim-Bey, did not even think it his duty to save the life of a poor christian servant who had been in his service for upwards of four years.

The church and the convent of Der-el-Kammar were still standing, the Druses had reserved them for the last. After having pillaged and burnt them they massacred the monks; then finding that there was nothing more to take, they set fire to the city. At least two thousand persons perished under the act of these furies.

These scenes of horror had continued during the whole of Wednesday and Thursday. The evening of that day, at half-past seven o'clock, the Governor of Beyrout, Kurchid Pacha, arrived.

There remained then at Der-el-Kammar, but one house alone untouched, that of a man named Halil Chaouyeh. That house, in which above eight hundred persons had taken refuge, could not be saved by the presence of the Mufti. On Friday at eight o'clock at night, the Druses entered it, put to death all the men and male children they found there, violated the women, and seized upon all the riches that had been carried there.

There were no more Christians at Der-el-Kammar, they were all either dead or dispersed to the mountains or towns on the sea coast. Kourchid Pacha thought that the time had arrived to announce by the firing of a gun *l'aman*, and to apprise the Druses to retire on pain of being attacked by the Sultan's troops. This order was very readily obeyed; Kourchid Pacha, after seeing the last house that was standing set fire to, quitted Der-el-Kammar, or rather the place on which stood Der-el-Kammar, not without first having a long conference with the three Druse chiefs, who had presided at the carnage, the Sheiks Sayd Bey, Djomblat, Abou-Macad-el-Kamade. *

The following account is taken from the letter of a missionary, dated from Saida, 4th June.

"During the week of Pentecost, a war that had for a long time been in contemplation between the Druses and the Christians in

* The preceding account is taken from an official paper published in the "Moniteur."

the mountains, at length broke out. The Christians were driven to desperation by the bad treatment of the Druse Chiefs, they saw that the government was powerless to do them justice for the many murders committed, of which they had been the victims. At length they rose up, and war began in the cantons that are opposite to Beyrouth. I will not here attempt to give you the description; I am too far from the seat of events, and am not sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances to do so; you shall be informed of them from Beyrout; but I will now tell you of what has occurred in the neighbourhood of Saida.

"When the country people from the canton of Seffah (*de la Pomme*) became aware of the movements that had taken place in other parts of the mountain, they began to gather round a man named Jusef-el-Mobaiedh at the village of Derb-Essin, about three-quarters of an hour's distance from Saida; there they became excited by the presence, on the bridge of the river which runs to the north of Saida, of a Druse chief, of the name of Thasem-Jusef, renowned for his cruelty. This man had with him only his Druse poignard, but he understood how to draw to his banner the Musselmans of the province of Kharroub (*du Caroubier*), on the north of Saida, by the allurement of pillage, and the hatred of the name of Christians. He very soon had a considerable number with him, of whom, the Marauders began to disturb the peaceful Christian gardeners of Saida, and even to chase them with blows of their guns. The authorities of the city remained silent.

"On Friday of the week of Pentecost, the chief Druses carried off the flocks from four Christian villages. The mob reassembled at Derb-Essin, marched upon him in following the chain of hills that coasted along the sea, at about half-an-hour's distance. The meeting very soon took place, the Christians did not distinguish themselves by their bravery; the people of the environs of Saida have a bad reputation in that respect; they are peasants, poor, fearful, and cast down by tyranny, it was with great difficulty their chief had managed to assemble them, they could not withstand the shock of the enemy; their chief

had already beaten two Druses, when finding himself abandoned by the soldiers, they took to flight, one party took the road to the mountain, the others hid themselves in the country, and some even flew for refuge towards the gate of the city to seek shelter there.

"But here was manifested the ill will and ferocity of the Mussulmen of the city; a cry of alarm resounded throughout all Saida, the women began to yell and utter imprecations against the Christians and their religion, the men now came out of the mosques; a great many of them had not even entered them, in order to be ready on the spot, it appeared to have been plotted beforehand, and that they had been engaged in the mosques to march against the Christians through zeal for their religion; they hurried to the streets armed, and those who could not get any arms seized enormous cudgels. The high part of the city, which should have been closed by order of the authorities, was open, the people threw themselves from there upon the runaways, and many inoffensive men who were coming in from the country, they surrounded them, threw them down, trampled them under foot, beat them, wounded them with knives; they discharged their fire-arms upon them, they cut many of them to pieces; the Ottoman troops of the line, who were there to preserve order, at the instigation of several of their officers, joined the Musselmen to fall upon the Christians."

After the hideous work done at Der-el-Kammar, the Druses went to the village of Betedine, and killed all the Christians who had taken refuge in the barracks there, as well as 109 persons belonging to that place and to the village of Mohasser. They then burnt Betedine, in presence of the Kaimacan and of the troops; returned to Der-el-Kammar, sacked the convent, killed the monks, and burnt the town. The massacres there had lasted the whole of Thursday, the 21st of June. The number of victims is estimated at 2,100, besides women and little girls. Scarcely a tenth of the population escaped. The names of the Druse chiefs who presided at these horrid scenes, are given in the report. It is to be hoped that neither they nor

the Turkish officers who, able to prevent, permitted and abetted these horrible crimes, will escape the punishment they have so richly earned. The report, heart-rending in its cruel details, reads like truth. We must revert to Cawnpore for a parallel to the atrocities it records.

Père Estève, superior of the missionaries in Syria, was sent in Paris, to give an account of the massacres and plunder which have taken place in Lebanon. He says that, at Damascus alone, more than 8,000 Christians have been put to death. The number of victims to Mahomedan fanaticism throughout Syria amounts to from 15,000 to 16,000. Forty nuns were saved through the exertions of Père Estève, who gave them refuge in his convent, where more than 1,500 persons were fed daily. Five nuns of the same community as the forty saved were murdered by the Druses.

The correspondent at Beirout, of the "Daily News," writing of the massacres on the 1st of June, 1860, says:—"It has been ascertained that the Druses had burnt and pillaged no fewer than 151 Christian villages since the 29th of May last, while no less than from 75,000 to 80,000 Christians of Lebanon, many of whom were a month ago wealthy men, others in quiet, easy circumstances, and all strangers to anything like poverty and want, are homeless beggars, depending on actual charity for their daily bread. Over and above the number of Christians shot in actual warfare, between 7,000 and 8,000 have been butchered—hacked to death would be the better term—in cold blood by the Druses; and besides this, more than 5,000 widows, who, until this Druse campaign, were happy wives and mothers, have lost their husbands, fathers, brothers, and all male relatives, even to the male infant at the breast, and 1,600 children are now orphans. Moreover, fifty millions sterling would not pay for the towns, villages, hamlets, and silk factories destroyed throughout the mountain —all property of Christians. There is, besides, a fearfully long list of convents, churches, and nunneries belonging to the same people, all of which have been plundered and then

destroyed by the Druses. In short, for the last twenty days it has been nothing less than a wholesale massacre of Christians by the Druses, and a wanton destruction by the latter of all property belonging to the former.

FRIGHTFUL BARBARITY OF THE DRUSES.

One poor woman—I knew both her husband and herself well at Deir-el-Kammar, where they were wealthy people—told me that when the Druses attacked the town a second time (I should mention that it had surrendered and all the inhabitants had given up their arms some twenty-four days previously to the Druses and had been promised protection by their Sheiks) her husband was hacked to pieces before her eyes with large knives by the Druses, who then declared they must kill all male children in the house. The mother tried to hide her two sons, one fifteen, the other nine years old. The Druses, however, found them out. She begged and prayed for their lives, and endeavoured to cover them in a corner with her person, but the Druses hacked at the lads over her shoulder, and gashed them till they both dropped down apparently lifeless. The Druses made off, and the woman thinking her two boys dead, remained in a sort of stupor for two hours so far as she could calculate. At last she was roused by hearing the eldest lad call her in a faint voice, trying to assure her that he was not yet dead. On this she felt the body of the young boy and found his heart beating. She got some water, and after giving it to both her children, started into the town to see whether she could procure assistance to get herself and her boys away. She got as far as the seraglio or government house, but there she found some five hundred Christians, who had taken refuge were being cut to pieces by the Druses, who had been invited to enter the precincts of the building by the Turkish soldiers of the garrison, these latter helping in the butchery, and being so far worse than the Druses, that they abused in the most infamous manner all the women. Seeing no help to be obtained here, the poor woman turned to fly,

when she came across an old Druse who had formerly been a farm servant of her husband's. After a great deal of entreaty on her part, the man consented to protect her and her children down to the sea coast, about four hours' journey, on condition of receiving an order on her brother, a wealthy man at Beyrout, for 10,000 piastres. To this she agreed, and they returned together to her house. She had not been absent more than an hour, but she found her two children cut into pieces, joint by joint, "limbs and trunk severed (to use her words), as butchers cut up sheep"—heads, legs, arms and bodies being hacked up into a shapeless mass of bloody flesh and reeking bones.

Some other poor women then joined her, and together they made their way to a mulberry plantation outside the town, where they passed the night. At daybreak they were discovered by a party of Druses, who, after stripping them to find whether they had any money on their persons, and taking away what little they possessed, told them they might go where they liked. Four of the poor creatures had babies, all under a year old. Of these infants two were girls, and two boys; the former they did not touch, but the latter, they said might grow up to be men, and bear arms against the Druses. They therefore took the poor little creatures, and before their mother's eyes tore them up the middle, and limb by limb—"exactly," to use the poor women's own expression, "as you tear up a fowl that is to be cooked with pillau." Remember, all this was done, not in the heat of fighting, but deliberately, in cold blood. And I have heard of eleven other exactly similar cases of child destruction by the Druses, in nine of which I implicitly believe, having every reason to do so.

Deir-el-Kammar contained, a month ago, a population of 8,000 souls, of whom about 4,000 were men and lads, 3,500 women and girls, and 500 children under ten years old. Of the men, not more than 150 have escaped; of the women and girls, about 2,000 have reached Beyrout; and of the young children, less than 200 are alive.

An English gentleman, however, without hesitation, promised his co-operation; and immediately placed his yacht in such a position as to enable her four small pieces of cannon to bear on the streets, and he armed his crew with muskets, swords, and pistols. He afterwards landed, examined the town, in order to see the points by which the Druses could enter; he then caused the women, children, and the more valuable portion of the property, to be placed in safety; and had certain points occupied by his men, taking other measures of defence. All this gave confidence to the peaceable part of the population, and overawed that which was suspected of connivance with the Druses. The latter were told by their spies that an English vessel of war was in port, that English troops had been landed; and they, in consequence, abandoned their projected attack on the town, and went away."

The 4th of July, 1860. One of the French missionaries in Syria, the Reverend Père Rousseau, addressed a letter (published in the "Union Franche-Comptoise) from Saida, giving an account of the massacres of the month of June, 1860, which he had either witnessed, or had an immediate knowledge of from his fellow labourers in the different localities that were the scenes of carnage and spoliation.

"In my last letter (says the writer), I gave you an account of the events which took place at Deir-el-Kamar—

"This city was then besieged by the Druses. Now it is without inhabitants, all the Christians who inhabited it have been massacred, with the exception of the small number of fugitives who had the good fortune to escape."

This communication is not only so graphic, but by all persons cognizant of the affairs spoken of, and acquainted with the writer, so well known to be an authentic and accurate narration, that it seems best to me the statement should be given in the writer's own words :—

"Si on excepte le Kesrouan, c'est-à-dire la partie du Liban comprise entre Beyrouth et Tripoli, partout ailleurs les chrétiens ont subi la mort ou les atrocités les plus révoltantes. Toutes

les habitations ont été pillées, brûlées et détruites par les Druses. Ces ennemis du nom chrétien se dirigent actuellement et se concentrent vers le Kesrouan.

" Le fait que je vais vous signaler vous donnera l'idée de la justice et de la protection que le gouvernement Turc accorde dans ce pays-ci aux chrétiens, et de la bonne foi qu'il apporte dans ses relations avec eux.

" Les Druses ont attaqué plusieurs fois Der-Kamar, mais ils avaient été vigoureusement repoussés par les chrétiens, et ils n'avaient plus reparu. Sur ces entrefaits, arriva à Der Kamar Taer-Pacha, général de division Turc. Il proposa un arrangement aux chrétiens, leur persuada de déposer les armes, prenant l'engagement de les défendre contre les Druses s'ils étaient attaqués. Les chrétiens consentirent à cette proposition. Un acte public fut rédigé et signé par les principaux de la ville et par le général lui-même. Peu de jours après, Taer-Pacha annonça qu'il allait retourner à Beyrouth. Les chrétiens manifestèrent leur craintes d'être ainsi livrés à la discrétion des Druses par cette absence; mais le général les reassura en leur disant que quiconque les attaquerait, attaquerait le gouvernement Turc même; qu'il avait donné des ordre formels au commandant de la garnison de la ville pour les défendre à outrance s'ils étaient attaqués.

" Le général retourna à Beyrouth, et de cette ville il leur écrivit pour réitérer ses engagements.

" Les chrétiens reçurent sa lettre, et deux heures aprés les Druses entraient par petites bandes dans Der-Kamar. Le soir la ville en était remplie. Alors commença le pillage, et il dura toute la nuit.

" Les principaux habitants de la ville, au nombre de six cents, se rendirent chez le gouverneur pour le prier de faire cesser le pillage et d'obliger les Druses à quitter la ville d'après les conventions arrêtées avec le général.

" Le gouverneur répondit qu'il n'avait point de pouvoir, mais que s'ils voulaient lui donner cent cinquante mille piastres, il les garderait chez lui et leur sauverait la vie. Les cent

cinquante mille piastres furent comptées. Dès que le gouverneur les eut reçues, il leur représenta que cette somme n'était point suffisante, qu'ils étaient riches et qu'il était en droit d'exiger d'eux quatre cent mille piastres. Les chrétiens lui firent observer que leurs maisons avaient été pillées, qu'ils n'avaient plus d'argent, mais qu'ils allaient lui faire un billet, qu'ils signeraient tous, portant obligation de cette somme.

" Après que les Druses eurent passé le premier jour et la nuit suivante à piller, ils passèrent une autre journée à massacrer les hommes et les enfants mâles. Les femmes et les filles furent réservées et soumises ensuite à tous leurs outrages. Quarante femmes ont été massacrées à Der-Kamar.

" Après le massacre des chrétiens de la ville, les Druses se sont portés au palais du gouverneur pour immoler les chrétiens qui s'y étaient réfugiés.

" Le gouverneur, malgré ses engagements, malgré les cent cinquante mille piastres qu'il avait reçues, malgré le billet de quatre cent mille piastres souscrit par les six cents principaux habitants de Der-Kamar, livra immédiatement ceux dont il avait garanti la vie.

" Les Druses commencèrent par leur arracher tous les vêtements. Lorsqu'ils eurent été mis dans une nudité complète, les Druses les massacrèrent à coups de poignard et de yatagans. Personne n'échappa. Un ruisseau de sang coulait du palais du gouverneur.

" Les filles et les femmes chrétiennes ont été déshonorées sous les yeux du gouverneur par les soldats du gouvernement; les soldats ont eu leur part partout. Ils ont combattu les chrétiens avec les Druses, ils ont pillé et massacré les chrétiens avec les Druses, ils ont déshonoré les femmes et les filles des chrétiens avec les Druses. On assure qu'aucune femme n'a échappé aux brutalités des soldats Turcs et des Druses.

" Après ces scènes de violence et d'horreur contre les femmes chrétiennes, les soldats Turcs et les Druses ont achevé le pillage; ils ont emporté le butin et mis le feu à la ville.

Der-Kamar, qui était une des villes les plus élégantes de Syrie, n'est plus maintenant qu'un monceau de ruines.

" Les nouvelles de l'entrée des Druses à Der-Kamar sont parvenues à Beyrouth pendant la première nuit, lorsque les Druses étaient encore occupés au pillage. Tous les consuls généraux se sont rendus en corps auprès de Kurchid Pacha, gouverneur général du pachalik de Saïda, pour le prier de se rendre à Der-Kamar afin d'empêcher le massacre des chrétiens. Le pacha partit immédiatement. Il pouvait et devait arriver à Der-Kamar en cinq heures. Il n'y a pas plus de distance de Beyrouth à cette ville. Il a mis vingt-cinq heures pour faire ce chemin.

" Au lieu de se rendre directement à Der-Kamar, le pacha a passé tout la journée pendant laquelle le massacre des chrétiens a eu lieu dans la maison du chef Druse qui avait ordonné le pillage et les scénes de carnage qui s'accomplissaient dans la malheureuse ville Der-Kamar. Lorsqu'il est arrivé, il ne restait plus que quarante chrétiens qui n'étaient pas massacrés. Il les a délivrés.

" Nous avions trois écoles à Der-Kamar. Deux de nos maîtres et un frère ont été tués. Notre maison, sur laquelle flottait, par ordre du consul-général, le drapeau de la France, n'a pas été respectée. Heureusement les Péres qui s'y trouvaient en residence étaient partis avant la derniére catastrophe.

" Il y a eu à Der-Kamar trois mille hommes de massacrés et quarante femmes, tant dans la ville que dans le palais du gouverneur. Six cents hommes ont réussi à se sauver.

" Chaque jour il nous arrive des centaines de femmes et d'enfants, qui viennent encore augmenter le nombre des malheureux â Saïda. On a été obligé d'en éxpédier sur d'autres points de la Syrie. Depuis plusieurs jours on en a transporté sur des barques et sur des batiments français et anglais du côté du Kesrouan entre Beyrouth et Tripoli, où se trouve, comme je vous l'ai dit, une nombreuse population de chrétiens.

" La ville de Zahlé comptait de douze à quinze mille habi-

tants, tous chrètiens. Les Druses avaient été repousées deux fois avec perte par les chrétiens de cette ville; mais une troisième fois, ils ont, dit-on, employé un stratagème qui leur a réussi. Les Druses savaient que les chrétiens de Zahlé attendaient un renfort: ils ont fabriqué des bannières et des croix qu'ils ont placées en tête d'une troupe de deux mille hommes. Les Druses s'ètaient déguisés. En arrivant près de Zahlé ils chantaient des chansons patriotiques en usage chez les chrétiens. Des habitants de Zahlé, trompés par cette ruse, sont venus sans défiance au devant de ces faux frères, qui les ont reçus à coups de fusil et qui, sans perdre de temps, sont tombés sur eux à coup de sabre et ont fait une grande boucherie.

" Malgré cette surprise, un grand nombre ont pu prendre la fuite. Déjà les femmes et les enfants s'étaient retirés dans les montagnes depuis quelques jours, en sorte que le massacre à Zahlé n'a pas été aussi grand que dans les autres villes; mais il a été bien douloureux pour nous, et surtout pour moi, par la perte que nous avons faite du P. Billotet, Franchecomtois comme moi. Le P. Billotet a été tué au moment où il prenait le Saint-Sacrement pour l'emporter ou le consommer. Trois frères ont été tués près de lui, et un grand nombre d'autres personnes qui s'ètaient réfugiées dans notre maison, croyant y trouver un asile sûr à l'ombre du drapeau de la France.

" Vingt et une religieuses auraient été déshonorées par les soldats Turcs et par les Druses dans la maison où elles s'étaient réfugiées. Je ne puis encore néanmoins garantir absolument la certitude de ce fait comme je garantis la vérité des autres.

" Deux de ces religieuses ont été tuées. Mais le fait qui a le plus effrayé les habitants de Zahlé et les a obligés à prendre la fuite, c'est d'avoir vu les soldats du gouvernement Turc tirer à coups de canon contre la ville, qui a été réduite en cendres.

" Racïa et Jadaïdi, villes situées dans l'Anti-Liban, viennent de subir le même sort par la trahison et la mauvaise foi de leurs gouverneurs.

"Un grand nombre de chrétiens, après la destruction des villes et villages qu'ils habitaient, avaient cherché un asile dans des cavernes et dans le fond des montagnes où se trouvent de petis bois. Les Druses, pour que personne des chrétiens n'échappe à leur fureur, ont parcouru les montagnes avec de gros chiens pour découvrir les chrétiens cachés. Ils en ont découvert une centaine en un seul endroit. Ils leur ont lié les mains derrière le dos pour les mettre à mort avec plus de cruauté. A quelques-uns ils abattaient un bras, à d'autres ils coupaient les mains, à plusieur sils enlevaient des morceaux de chair, ils leur crevaient les yeux ou les brûlaient vivants.

"Beyrouth, malgré la présence des consuls généraux et de plus de vingt bâtiments de guerre qui stationnent dans le port, n'est ni sûr ni tranquille. Les Turcs ont été sur le point de se soulever. A la moindre alerte, les chrétiens seraint massacrés. Ils le savent; aussi un grand nombre sont partis pour Alexandrie et pour Marseille.

"A Saïda, à cause des mêmes craintes, craintes tout aussi fondées, les principales familles se sont expatriées. Dans cette ville, tout était prêt pour le massacre et pour le pillage. Le jour et la nuit étaient désignés. Le gouverneur Turc et le mufti étaient sur le point de donner le signal, lorsque l'amiral qui stationne à Beyrouth a été averti du danger qui nous menaçait. Il nous a envoyé en tout hâte un des bâtiments qu'il a sous ses ordres."

A letter from Mr. Cyril Graham to Lord Dufferin gives a connected narrative of the late massacres. Lord John Russell is told by Lord Dufferin :—Your Lordship may rely with implicit confidence upon the accuracy of all Mr. Graham's statements of facts, as his knowledge of Arabic and his personal acquaintance both with the Druse and the Maronite populations, combined with the opportunities he has had of visiting the places where these tragedies have occurred, will have given him peculiar facilities for arriving at the truth."

"MR. GRAHAM TO LORD DUFFERIN.

"Beyrout, July 18.

"Although many and various accounts have no doubt appeared in the public press of the horrors which have been committed within the last two months in Syria, and I have sent you, from the beginning, constant reports of the progress of this 'war,' yet it will no doubt be interesting to you, and to English people in general, to have a connected sketch of the whole of this sad affair, from the commencement of hostilities up to the present moment. Having been in the country during the whole of the war, and having seen, perhaps, more of its horrors than any other European, and, moreover, having had no other employment than that of seeking after accurate information with regard to affairs, I may feel some confidence in the accuracy of the account I send you; and harassing and painful as the details will appear, nevertheless they are but too true. It is to be remembered that in the summer of last year a skirmish took place at the village of Beit Meri, two hours and a-half from Beyrout, one Sunday afternoon. Several persons were killed on both sides, but happily the affair had no further consequences at that time. However, the bad feeling which had subsisted previously to that time between the Maronites and the Druses, was in nowise improved by two parties of them having fought it out; and although a perfect reconciliation was proclaimed, yet it was generally feared that in the present year, 1860, hostilities would be renewed, unless the Government took measures to prevent bloodshed. The Druses were the first aggressors, for early in May a monk was found murdered in a convent, halfway between Beyrout and Deir-el-Kammar; and, although the actual murderers were never identified, there was not the slightest doubt that they were Druses, for no Christian would ever dare to touch a priest. The Christians then retaliated, and killed the first Druse they found. Then two Christians were killed by the Druses by the Damoor

river, between this and Sidon, and their relatives in return killed two Druses, according to the law of blood feud among all those nations. At this time, had the Government used the slightest exertions, they might have prevented this feud then spreading. I was with Said Bek Jumblad, the great chief of the Druses at Moktarah, not far from Bleddin, the old palace of the Emir Beshir, when things had arrived at this stage, and I urged him to do all in his power to stop further bloodshed.

"On the 28th of May the war broke out in all its fury. In the evening of that day thirty-two villages were seen burning from Beyrout, and some of the most flourishing places in the Lebanon, on the morning of the 29th, were uninhabited and in ruins. The Druses even advanced to within forty minutes' march of Beyrout, and, in the face of the Pacha and all his camp (for he had pretended to go out with his army in order to stop the war), burnt, and plundered, and slaughtered people in the rich village of Hadad, the residence of a house of the Emirs. In this instance it is said—and there is every reason to believe the report to be true—that the Turkish soldiers fired upon the flying Christians. On the 29th of May also, Hasbeya, a large town under Mount Hermon, was first attacked by the Druses: a Moslem Emir of the family of the Shehab lived there, who had for a long time been a great annoyance to the Pachas of Damascus, his authority being very great there. Last year, Ahmed Pacha, Governor of Damascus, sent a detachment of troops to occupy the towns under Hermon, and he had lately sent a strong reinforcement, under the command of Othman Bek, whose name will ever be mentioned with abhorrence by Christians. This man, on the day of the attack on Hasbeya, told the Christians that he had been sent to protect them from the Druses, but that they must lay down their arms, otherwise they would incur the displeasure of the Government. They accordingly obeyed, believing that he would keep his word. For 'greater security' he invited them all into the Serai Palace, used as a barrack, and the men, with the women and children, crowded into this building. The

arms they had delivered up were then put on the backs of mules, and sent off with an escort, professedly to Damascus, but with so small a one that it would be mockery to call it an escort. Before the mules were well out of the valley of Hasbeya, the Druses, as had been intended, fell upon them; the soldiers made no resistance, and all the arms fell into the hands of the Druses.

"The Christians, meanwhile, penned up in the Serai, with hardly any food and water, were now in a state of great suffering. On the 5th of June they began to feel great alarm, for they saw the harem of the Governor preparing to depart. To the questions of the Christians as to the cause of this movement, only evasive answers were given. On the 6th, many of the soldiers were seen leaving; then the unfortunate people, when it was too late, saw clearly how treacherously they had been deceived. They rushed into the outer court and entreated to be let out. The signal was then given, the gates thrown open, and in rushed the Druses, armed with any weapon they could seize, and then commenced an indiscriminate slaughter of all the males. Some, indeed, made their way through the door to the outer gate, only to be seized by the Turkish soldiery; nor were these passive only in the transaction. Many Christians whom I have examined, have sworn to me that they saw the soldiers themselves taking part in the slaughter, and the subsequent behaviour of these brutal troops to the women, was savage in the extreme. From the wounds I have seen, both on the living and the dead, it would appear that they went to work with the most systematic cruelty; 10, 12, and 14 deep cuts on the body of one person are not unfrequent; some of the wounds show that they were made with blunt instruments. In short, everything was used which came to hand, and, according to the nature of the weapon, hands and limbs were cut off, or brains dashed out, or bodies mangled. Of all the men in the Serai, some 40 or 50 only escaped; many of these had been severely wounded and left for dead, while some few hid themselves among the dead bodies and made their escape by night. Some

of these reached Beyrout, their clothes literally saturated with blood from the bodies under which they had lain. Women the Druses did not slaughter, nor, for the most part, I believe, ill-use; that was left for Turks and Moslems to do, and they did it. Little boys of four and five years old were not safe; these would be seized from the mother and dashed on the ground, or torn to pieces before her face; or, if her grasp was too tight, they would kill it on her lap; and, in some cases, to save further trouble, mother and child were cut down together. Many women have assured me that the Turkish soldiers have taken their children, one leg in each hand, and torn them in two. So when the sun set on the 6th of June, scarcely a male was left of the large and prosperous population under Hermon; for on that same day, and nearly under similar circumstances, the Christians of Rasheya were massacred.

"The Emir Shehab, whom I have before mentioned, and almost all his house, were killed, and they Moslems. In no other instance had the Druses dared even to touch the poorest Moslems; but these men—men of rank and standing—were enemies of the Pasha of Damascus personally, and so they were sacrificed—not, it will be believed, without the deputy of the Pacha having beforehand signified his approbation. If we had no other evidence than this, we should have enough to prove to us how guilty the officers of the Porte have been. While the unfortunate creatures who had taken refuge in the Serai at Hasbeya were suffering from hunger and thirst, the people of Sidon, who for some days previously had been in a state of constant alarm, were attacked on the 1st of June by the Bashi-Bazouks and other Moslems. For several days the slaughter continued. No Christian outside the town was in safety. If a man or a male child, he was cut down; if a woman, she was sure to be brutally ill-used. This encouraged the Druses greatly, who said, 'After all, the Moslems understand the work best.' The Druses then broke into, and destroyed the monastery above Sidon, killing 16 monks, and yet the Governor of Sidon did not even attempt to interfere, although, Sidon being a walled

town, he had only to close the gates and prevent any armed Druse from entering. The Bashi-Bazouks escaped also with impunity. I should have mentioned before, that a great number of refugees from the villages in the mountains, which had been burnt in the first attack of the 28th of May, who were escaping to Beyrout, and were, indeed, within three hours' walk of their goal, were fallen upon by the Druses or irregular troops, and cut to pieces. This happened on the 30th or 31st of May.

"On the 3rd of June, the first great attack was made on Dier-el-Kammar, the ancient capital of the Lebanon, containing a population of about 7,000. The very morning of that day the American missionary, Mr. Bird, had been entreated by the natives of two of the neighbouring villages to go to their relief and bring them to Deir-el-Kammar, where they believed they would be in greater security. He immediately called on the Mustsellin, commander of the troops, and asked for an escort, which, with some difficulty, was given to him. He had not been gone above an hour and a half before the Druses suddenly came down upon the town, crying their war-cry. A tremendous fire was kept up till night; many of the Christians were killed, and on this occasion, it is said, from 70 to 80 Druses, for the Christians defended themselves well. On the following day, however, when the Druses again appeared (they had retired after it became dark), the Christians wished to solicit peace, and Mr. Bird, who early in the morning of the 4th had succeeded in re-entering the town, went to the Druse chiefs as the envoy of the people. Peace, indeed, was granted, but the Druses made their own terms. They immediately entered the town and for three days continuously, were plundering and carrying off everything they could move; while, within a stone's throw of the town, no Christian was safe, and many wanton murders were committed. One poor old man who could scarcely crawl so far, had led his cow to the ——— for green pasture, and two Druses immediately pounced upon him and cut him down. Why the rest of the inhabitants at that moment were spared at all, I know not.

"The next great scheme was to surprise and take Rahleh. The usual population of this place is about ten thousand; but at that moment (early in June) there were said to be double that number, so many of the inhabitants of the villages round about having sought refuge there. At the first report of the successes of the Druses, a large body of their brethren came up from the Hauran, under the command of the warlike and savage chief, Ismail-el-Atrash. These fellows came up simply from a wish for plunder, and brought with them numbers of Arabs of the small nomadic tribes who encamped about the Hauran. They all marched up the Bokaa, as the great plain of Cœlesyria, between the chains of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon is called, and halted near the ravine which leads up to Zahleh. There they were joined by all kinds of rabble—Kurds from Damascus and Homs, and Metawalis from Baalbek, all joining with the hope of plunder and of butchering the christians.

"The moment the news of this movement reached Beyrout, the Consuls-General of the five great powers did all in their power to prevent further bloodshed. They went to the Pacha, asked him if he was going to do anything, protested loudly against his inactivity—for he had never moved since the first outbreak, when he pitched his encampment half an hour from the town—and insisted on his doing something to keep off the danger impending on Zahleh. He said, 'Well, I will send some troops to protect the place.' He did so; but this was only the signal for its destruction. No sooner did the Druses on this side of the Lebanon, who, since the affair of Deir-el-Kammar, had been comparatively idle, see the movement of the Turkish troops, than they raised their war cry, and headed by one of their principal Shieks (who has the rank of Bek in the Turkish service) rushed onwards to Zahleh. From the easternmost ridge of the Lebanon, several deep ravines run into the plain of Cœlesyria; in one of these, and half-way down it, Zahleh is situated. It was the largest and most rising town in all the Lebanon, the chief station of the French Lazarists, and

contained public buildings, a very handsome cathedral and schools, and very good houses. . The people of Zahleh had already sent to the Druses in the Bokaa to ask for peace, but the conditions were so humiliating, so utterly preposterous, that they could not possibly accept them. Their very nature showed at once that they did not originate with the Druses, but with the Moslems of Damascus. On the 19th of June, the Ottoman troops and the Druses of the Lebanon appeared above Zahleh, which was no sooner perceived by those in the Bokaa than a simultaneous movement took place towards the town. The Christians evacuated it at once, climbed up the steep mountain side, and expected to get round the Lebanon Druses, and then fall upon them in the ravine. They were much too slow; before they had well reached the summit of the mountain, they saw that the two forces had met, and were beginning to burn the town from either end. After firing some volleys, they took to flight, as they saw that in addition to all, the Turkish troops had turned against them; only the aged, infirm, and some women and children were left in the town—they were slaughtered. Two of the French Lazarists were killed and another wounded. Europeans were no longer safe. In the attack on Zahleh, the troops under the command of one Mûribek took a more open part than they had done before; they even made use of a fieldpiece that they had brought with them to fire upon the town, and one shot from this is said to have brought down the bell of the cathedral. So much for Kurschid Pacha's promises.

"The Druses, now elated with success and plunder, turned again upon Deir-el-Kammar; the wretched people hearing of their approach prepared to make the best of the fight, but the Governor, who had 500 troops in the Serai, while at Bleddin, half a mile off, there were three hundred more, told them they had nothing to fear if they would give him up their arms, and he insisted on their doing so. They applied for an escort to come to Beyrout. This he would in nowise permit, so they could only do as they were bid. Their valuables he made them

place in the Serai, and then ordered a great part of the population there. So men, women, and children were all crowded together in the Serai under his protection on the night of the 20th. On the morning of the 21st of June, the Druses collected round the town. One of their leaders came to the Serai, and desired to speak to the Governor. A conversation was carried on in a low voice by means of an interpreter (for the Turk did not know Arabic); at last a question was asked, to which they heard the Governor give the answer, "Hepsi" ("Ab," in Turkish). Thereupon the Druse disappeared, but in a few moments the gate was thrown open, and in rushed the fiends, cutting down and slaughtering every male, the soldiers co-operating. In short, a second tragedy like that at Hasbeya was enacted, only in this case the slaughter was more dreadful. Those who had not entered the Serai fared no better; all were to be killed, and those who had crossed the stream and reached Bleddin in safety, were shot down by the troops quartered there. Those who had escaped had managed to hide themselves in drains, and some of the wounded crawled away. I have had a vivid description of the whole scene from some dozens of women who were there. They have told me how, before their very face, they have seen husband, father, brothers, and children, cut to pieces; how in trying to save the life of a child they have been knocked down, and the child torn from them and cut to pieces, and the pieces thrown in their face; how they have been insulted by the Turkish soldiery; and how in their way down to the sea the Druses had robbed them of everything they possessed. And it must be remembered that there were people at Deir-el-Kammar who were very wealthy and lived in well-built and comfortable houses, people who had been well-educated and used to luxury, and now have to beg their bread. The number of killed in this horrible massacre, has been variously estimated; some say that 900, some that 1,800 persons were killed. I have good reason to believe, after a careful comparison of all the accounts, that from 1,100 to 1,200 males actually perished in that one day. The Druses

then set fire to the town; the smoke came over Beyrout as a column of cloud, and warned us of the calamity. I myself can testify that the accounts are not much exaggerated: I travelled over most of the open country before the war was over, and came to Deir-el-Kammar a few days after the massacre. Almost every house was burnt, and the streets crowded with dead bodies, most of them stripped and mutilated in every possible way. My road led through the town, and through some of the streets my horse could not even pass, for the bodies were literally piled up. Most of those I examined had many wounds, and in each case was the right hand either entirely or nearly cut off; the poor wretch, in default of weapons, having instinctively raised his arm to parry the blow aimed at him. I saw little children, of not more than three or four years old, stretched on the ground, and old men with grey beards. In some places you could see the expression of agony; in others, of last despair. One poor creature, on his knees, had been cut down as he appealed to the mercy of his murderers. I saw bodies without heads, and heads lying alone about the place—all lying unburied, to be devoured by the hyænas and wild beasts. While in the midst of this scene of death—a scene which would have forced any one, I should have supposed, to be sober—some Druses, who had came to carry off what remaining bits of timber there might be in the houses, were laughing and joking at the appearance of the victims. I expressed my horror of such brutal behaviour to the great Chief of the Druses, and urged him to have the dead buried. He laughed, and asked me why. I have some hopes that this has been done, as he promised to give an order for it, although he said it would be difficult to induce the Druses to bury Christian carcases.

"When the account reached Beyrout the horror and indignation were indescribable. Used as we had become to such horrors, yet this surpassed all, and revealed a degree of treachery on the part of the Pasha which it would be almost impossible to persuade a sober European statesmen could be

practised by an official in the high position of a governor of a great province. The Pasha reached Deir-el-Kammar the day after the slaughter; a fact, 'which he will ever lament and deplore as long as he lives;' that is what he says, so, of course it is true. The details had barely reached us when, on Sunday afternoon, the 26th June, the French brig-of-war *Sentinelle*, brought us alarming reports from Sidon. The Druses were again threatening the place, and the Mufti had been preaching in the mosque, and even in the streets, 'Death to the Christians!' and calling upon the faithful to behold how the cause of the righteous triumphed. 'Now is the time,' he was heard to proclaim, 'God has given the infidel into our hands.' On the preceding night, Sept. 25, armed Druses had been allowed to sleep in the town, and Moslems, with weapons of different kinds, had passed the night in the mosque, ready at any moment, should the Druse begin the carnage, to aid them to the best of their power. And on the following night it was believed the slaughter would take place. Two English and two French men-of-war immediately steamed off, and anchored at Sidon before sunset, and this intimidated the fanatics, and, in all probability, prevented an outbreak. It was found on inquiry that a trap had indeed been laid here also, for the Governor of Sidon had disarmed all the Christians, on the plea that in the then disturbed state of the country it was deemed necessary for people to be disarmed, while, at the same time, he permitted the Druses and Moslems to enter and remain in the town without taking from them any of their arms. Nothing could be more unjust than this; nothing could more clearly show the bad end he had in view. On being officially asked if it was true, he did not deny it, but said that in future he would have all parties to give up their arms: but on being desired to give this promise in writing, he refused, saying that after all it was not in his power to prevent the Druses bringing their arms into Sidon, although he had a garrison of three hundred troops there, and cannon, and he was in a walled town.

"After the butchery of Deir-el-Kammar, and while the panic was going on at Sidon, Beyrout itself was menaced, and, but for the presence of several European men-of-war, this place would have shared the fate of other towns. Almost all the native merchants have escaped to Alexandria; and to improve matters, a Moslem was found murdered. This created a great sensation; the Moslems insisted on the execution of a Christian, and some poor fellow was seized, tried, and executed in a very few hours, who had probably as much to do with the murder, as the Emperor of China. The Consuls General could now no longer have any confidence in the Pasha, and they determined to send a joint letter to the great chief of the Druses themselves, demanding that they should cease from further hostilities. Murders were daily going on, Beyrout and Sidon were in danger, and thousands of persons who had congregated in the Kesrouan (as the district north of the Dog River is called) were in hourly expectation of an attack. The Druse chiefs clearly showed that they had not been the chief agents in the mountain war. They had sold themselves to the pashas, and they evaded giving any direct answer.

"But this attempt on the part of Consuls General of the Five Powers was successful for the moment. The pasha heard of the letter; he saw that he had been detected, and then his only hope was to insist on peace. We have since found, as, indeed, we suspected only too well at the time, that a repetition of the massacres of Hasbeya and Deir-el-Kammar had been projected in the Kesrouan. The Druses were to have marched to the borders of this district, the Pasha was to have sent a large force of Ottoman troops "to preserve order and to protect the Christians from the Druses," and then the carnage would have begun, and probably never would have ended until the Druses and Moslems had slaughtered the greater part of the Christian population in Lebanon. Thousands must have perished had this infamous policy been carried out. The result, then, has been the official declaration of peace in Lebanon

on one condition only; that the Christians are to look upon bygones as bygones. The Pasha went through the farce of summoning an equal number of representatives from both races, but those who came on the part of the Christians were traitors who had been bribed; nor, indeed, had they been altogether honest men, would they have dared to do otherwise than the Pasha chose to dictate. Poor, wretched people! 'Bygones to be bygones!' How many thousands are ruined and destitute; how many women are altogether unprotected, and their homes and goods gone! Sixty towns and villages in Lebanon are burnt, and this goodly mountain has become a black desert.

"It is said that 75,000 persons are destitute. This seems a great number; but some idea may be formed of the depopulation when I state that the English man-of-war alone brought to Beyrout, from Sidon and the Damur river, 2,400 refugees, about 2,110 of whom were women and female children. Most of the boys who had reached this had escaped in women's clothes. All wish to leave the country. The poor people are panic stricken, and if they could get away scarcely any of the Christians wonld remain an hour longer under the Turkish rule. But here again has been another atrocious tyranny and premeditated extinction of the Christian race. These poor creatures, who have been for some time wishing to leave Damascus and other towns for fear of their lives, have been prevented by the Pashas, who will not give them a *tesheré* (pass), although they have not the slightest right to withhold it, for any subject may travel about the Ottoman dominions at pleasure.

"It is difficult to say how many Christians have been killed in all the mountain massacres. The numbers are rated very differently, some rating the number of deaths at 4,000, others at as many as 10,000. This last number is a very great exaggeration, and I should place the maximum at 4,000; for from the best information I have been able to collect from many sources, I rate the number of killed at Deir-el-Kammar at 1,100 or 1,200; at Hasbeya and Rasheya, 700; at Sidon, 550;

so that in the three great massacres from 2,250 to 2,350 males fell. Above 200 refugees were cut to pieces on the 30th and 31st of May, near Beyrout, and if 1,000 more Christians were killed in the villages I should say that was quite the outside; so that I should not be inclined to think that more than 3,500 have actually perished—but 3,500 males; and that takes a great deal out of a population whose whole wealth and prosperity depends on its energy.

"On Wednesday, the 11th of July, a Turkish line-of-battle ship and two frigates entered the bay, having on board about 3,000 troops. This caused a fresh panic, and all those who had lingered here now made their preparations to depart, for the Consuls insisted on the Pacha permiting those who wished to leave to embark. The Christians of Beyrout felt now that it was all over with them. Hitherto they had looked with comfort to the foreign men-of-war at anchor in the bay; now they feel they are between two fires, and this great additional military force being landed, instead of giving security, adds only to the insolence of the Moslems, and, consequently, to the danger of the Christians.

"So far goes my sketch of the war in Lebanon. This war (it is farce using the term when the whole has been a butchery) has now been concluded; and would that my relation of horrors could conclude with it! Almost the very day on which peace was proclaimed a fanatical outbreak broke out at Damascus. We had been expecting it. Indeed, all those best acquainted with Syria, have for three or four years foreseen that some dreadful tragedy would be enacted in this country, especially in the capital. In no place is the fanaticism stronger than at Damascus, and the Christians are in such a minority that the very thought of a general slaughter is too dreadful. The Moslems number about 130,000, and the Christians not more than 15,000. The train, which had been long laid, was fired on Monday, the 9th of July, at two o'clock p.m. The house of the Russian Consul was the first to be attacked, then some of the houses of the leading Christian merchants, each,

according to the abominable custom of this country, being set on fire. This work was found to be too slow for them, so they went off to the Aleppo-gate (Bab Tûma), and commenced burning the whole Christian quarter systematically. I am not going to enter into further details, as the affair of Damascus is not yet over; but up to the moment the last despatch went, which was eight days after the commencement of the affair, the Christian quarter was still burning, the cry of the Moslem still raging, and the thirst for blood not yet satiated. No one is safe. The streets are crowded by fanatics who continually shout 'Death to the Christians! Come, let us slaughter the Christians; let not one remain.' The Europeans, up to the time of the last despatch, had escaped, no thanks to the people, for they have burnt all the Consulates except the British and Russian, and call loudly that the Russian and French Consuls be delivered up to them. The very few Europeans at Damascus have found refuge with Abdel-Kader or with Mr. Brent, her Britannic Majesty's Consul, who by his firm and splendid behaviour has been the means, up to the present, of saving many lives. But he is regularly besieged with some 100 refugees in his house, and any moment may be his last. To add to these horrors, the Arabs and Kurds have come into the city, and besides plundering and murdering the men, they carry off the women. And the Pacha has done nothing. Ahmed Pacha never ordered the gates to be closed; and the Ottoman troops have distinguished themselves by their eagerness to slaughter the Christians and illtreat the women. Otman Beg, the same who was at Hasbeya, entered Damascus a few days ago, and received the honours of a conquering hero. Nothing can be more infamous than the behaviour of Ahmed Pacha and of all the officials. We all tremble for Aleppo, Homs, Hama, even for Jerusalem. May these places escape! I fear not. At all events Aleppo will hardly remain quiet."

Account of the commencement of the Damascus massacre, by M. Wetzlern:

"Damascus, 10th July, 4 p.m.—I hasten to inform you, by

express, that yesterday, at two o'clock p.m., a circumstance, in itself of little importance, but which was probably not accidental, led to the sacking of all the Christian quarters. Two hours later, fire was added to pillage, and both continue down to the present moment; but as the last streets of the quarter are now burning, the destruction will soon be complete. The four principal asylums of the Christian population in this calamity are the Consulates of Prussia, England, the palace of Abd-el-Kader, and the citadel. The Consulates of France, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and the United States of America, have all been burned. Thanks to the good sense of the inhabitants of Damascus, the number of plunderers did not exceed 500 yesterday; during the night it increased to 1,200; and this day at noon, including the Bedouin and Druse peasants, who kill without pillaging, there are 2,400 in all. But the government had here, as elsewhere, decided on the destruction of the Christian quarter, for the 5,000 soldiers, or thereabouts, both regular and irregular, who, without even employing force, might have prevented the whole affair, surrounded the Christian quarter; and while they allowed the pillagers to pass freely, massacred the Christians or drove them back into the flames. Nevertheless, owing to the kindness of a great number of the citizens (Mahometan), the majority of the Christian community, which amounted to about 25,000 souls, have been saved. Hundreds of Mussulman families have sheltered the fugitives in their houses.

"D. WETZLERN."

Another letter from Beyrout, dated the 15th July, gives further details:—

"Damascus, is the real capital of Syria, and is the largest city of Asiatic Turkey. It is considered by all Moslems a holy town, as from it departs, and to it arrives every year the haj, or pilgrim caravan, to and from Mecca. The population of Damascus exceeds 150,000, of which 130,000 are Moslems, 15,000 Christians, and 6,000 Jews. Ever since the murder of

the Christians by the Druses in Lebanon commenced, and more particularly since it became every day more and more evident to all men that the Turkish government showed partiality to the Druses, the more disreputable Moslems of Damascus have been exceedingly insolent to the Christians. These low Moslems are a numerous, a very troublesome, and an exceedingly bigoted race in all large Oriental towns, and are tenfold more so in Damascus than any place I know in Asia. Hearing how the Government had everywhere not only sided against their co-religionists, but how it had everywhere in Lebanon actually helped to betray, if not really to murder them, the Christians of Damascus were from the very outset disheartened and frightened, as well they might be, when threatened from day to day that the Moslems would rise and exterminate them. Matters got worse and worse, the one party becoming daily more frightened, the other hourly more insolent, until at last, on Sunday, the 8th inst., when the Christians came out of their various churches, a mob of Moslem lads were busy in the streets making crosses in chalk on the ground, and then stamping and spitting on the sacred emblem. But so utterly downhearted were the Christians, that they did not even complain to the authorities of this wanton insult. On the contrary, all they did was to confine themselves still more strictly within their houses for the rest of the day. What must, then, have been their astonishment on the Monday morning to see these same lads who had made and spat upon the crosses on the previous day, sweeping the streets of the Christian quarter in chains by order of the Turkish head of police. They at once supposed that this order must have been given for the very purpose of exciting a riot, and they were not mistaken. At two p.m., some 300 of the lowest Moslems of Damascus rushed armed into the Christian quarter, crying out, 'Slay the dogs of Christians! and immediately the work of plunder, burning, and murder commenced. Achmet Pacha, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of the place—Field-Marshal in the Sultan's army—was at once informed of what had taken place.

But although he had at his disposal some eight hundred regular troops and several field pieces, not a gun nor a man did he move. He never showed himself in the streets, nor took any steps whatever to stop the massacre, declaring—the old story of Hasbeya, Rasheya, Deir-el-Kammar, and Sidon—that he had not troops enough to do any good. The Russian Consulate was almost the first house attacked, and all those Christians who did not take refuge with the famous Algerine Chief, Abd-el-Kader (who has behaved most nobly throughout the business), were murdered at once. But, although the affair might have been stopped with the greatest ease before dark on the Monday, after that hour the mob increased in numbers every minute. Late in the evening about 300 soldiers were sent to put a stop to the outrage, but very shortly joined in the plundering; such as did not do so, actually used their arms to massacre the Christians. The whole Christian quarter—which includes some of the finest palaces to be found in the empire—was soon one mass of flames; and—for this there is the positive authority of an European eye-witness, who was hiding in the neighbourhood all that fearful night—as the Christians tried to escape from the flames they were thrust back on the burning piles by the bayonets of the Turkish regular troops. However, when we recollect that one of the military chiefs who commanded in Damascus was Osman Beg, the miscreant who but three weeks previously had delivered up at Hasbeya upwards of fifteen hundred Christians to be massacred by the Druses, all wonder at the conduct of the military ceases at once. An Englishman, who has shown great personal courage and example throughout this awful tragedy, writes that from the very first the mob cried out that the soldiers were on their side and would not hurt them, using this as an argument to their brother fanatics to 'kill all the dogs of Christians, not to spare one; to burn their houses, plunder their property, dishonour their wives, tear in pieces their children, and rid the holy city of all save the true followers of the true prophet.' In another letter, from a sober-minded Englishman, whose word no one

can doubt who knows the man, the writer says—'All this last fearful night, Turkish soldiers and Moslem men, women and children continue to pass my door in an unbroken stream; all laden with spoil, most drunk with blook and rapine, all blaspheming the name of Christ and Christians in shouts fearful to hear and too horrid to repeat.'

"What the Turkish authorities did may be summed up in one word—'Nothing.' No less than six times did that gallant old man Mr. Brent, the English Consul, and the Reverend Mr. Robson, Irish Presbyterian missionary, at the utmost risk of their lives, go together to the Pacha Achmet and urge him to do something to save the lives of the Christians. No: he said he could, and showed that he would, do nothing, but remained 'consulting' in the castle. When the last despatches left Damascus, at two p.m., on Thursday, the 12th instant, the burning, slaughter, murder, pillage, and other atrocities continued not merely as bad, but worse than ever, for the miscreant fanatics of the place had been just then joined by a host of Bedouins, Kurds, Druses, and other scoundrels, who were only too happy for the chance of pillage.

"When our last advices from Damascus left that place, the whole Christian quarter had been utterly destroyed. Four thousand Christians had taken refuge in the house of Abd-el-Kader, who defended them against all comers. Three thousand had taken refuge in the castle under the Pacha, and several hundred in the English Consulate, which as yet—being situated in the Moslem quarter of the town—had been respected. Upwards of 2,000 Christians, it was calculated, had been murdered all in cold blood; and the estimated loss of property, money, valuables, &c., was £1,200,000 sterling.

"It will hardly be believed that, with all these facts more or less known to the authorities, the Turkish troops who arrived here before daybreak on Tuesday, the 10th instant, from Constantinople, only left yesterday (Saturday the 14th) for Damascus.

"From Aleppo, the news is bad. They had not heard of the

Damascus massacre, but fully expected, almost every hour, the Moslems of the town to rise on the Christians. Captain Paynter, of her Majesty's ship Exmouth, senior naval officer here, has despatched her Majesty's ship Mohawk to Latakia and Alexandretta, so as to pick up and save fugitives from Moslem fanaticism.

"In Beyrout the panic among the native Christians has been something fearful yesterday and to-day. They are embarking by hundreds in the different merchant steamers to Alexandretta, Alexandria, Corfu, Malta, and even for England. Nearly all the French and English merchants are sending away their families to Europe. All trade is stopped for the present. Syria has had a blow from which she will not recover for sixty years. Men who were yesterday wealthy are now, owing to these disturbances and the bad faith shown by the Turkish Government, beggars. Six weeks ago commercial bills used to be paid at maturity as punctually in Beyrout as in London; now a bill due is a bill protested. Native merchants shut up their magazines and are off—off anywhere to get away from Turkish rule and treachery. In Alexandria all the refugees that have fled there have been very handsomely treated by Said Pacha, who gives food to the poorest, money to many, houses to all. In Beyrout the English and Americans have formed a fund to relieve the poor, who have fled to this place in thousands. The French have done the same. The Sisters of Charity have relieved hundreds every day with food. The French, English, Russian, Austrian, and Prussian consuls (to say nothing of the American missionaries, who daily feed 300 people) give bread, cooked meat, rice, clothes, &c., to several hundreds of these poor, starved, burnt-out peasants. All the medical men have attended to their wounds and sickness gratis, and even the crews of her Majesty's ships Exmouth and Mohawk, as well as the French imperial frigate Zènobie, have contributed their mites.

"What have the local Turkish authorities done to relieve

all this misery—for gigantic misery it must be, considering there are 150 Christian villages burnt, and 75,000 Christians without home or bread—what, I ask, have the local Turkish authorities done to relieve this misery, either individually or collectively? The answer is in one word—'nothing,' absolutely and literally nothing; not one penny have they given in the way of food, clothing, or shelter!"

In a letter from Damascus, in December, we find the following account of the frightful mortality amongst the unfortunate survivors of the Maronites of the Lebanon :—

"From statements that have been made to me by one whose word I have every reason to believe, that the Moslems of Damascus had sworn on the Koran that, as soon as the infidels had left Syria, no Christian should be left alive within a summer day's journey of the Holy City. I believe that if we want Syria to be quiet, and don't wish for the renewal of the horrors of last year, the present French army of occupation must remain at any rate over the spring. The mortality amongst the Christians of the Lebanon is fearful to contemplate. The bad and insufficient food which they have had to put up with, the want of houses to shelter them from the weather, and the mental anxiety, only too natural to men who have lost their all, and to women who have lost their husbands, sons, brothers, and fathers, is beginning to tell upon them. I have the authority of Colonel Burnaby, of the Guards—that excellent English officer who has volunteered for the mission of helping the Christians to rebuild their houses—for saying that, in very many of the Christian villages, the people are dying at the rate of sixty per cent! This is something fearful to contemplate. At this rate the whole of the mixed districts of the mountain would be entirely depopulated in less than two years. And, remember, this mortality is notwithstanding the large sums spent by the British Syrian Relief Fund and the various French charities to relieve the sufferers."

THE STATE OF DAMASCUS.

The following letter from Damascus, dated August 4th, was published in the "Levant Herald." It gives a deplorable account of the state of the city, and of the measures taken by Fuad Pacha on his arrival:—

"I was quite right in my prediction that the people of Damascus would not have the courage to fight. Before daylight yesterday morning several parts of the city were occupied by troops; lists of the guilty were entrusted to superior officers sent to different quarters; every outlet from the city was guarded overnight, and before sunset 360 men—all of whom are supposed to have earned death—were prisoners. Not a shot was fired, nor was it required; there was nothing like resistance, except in the case of two individuals, who were at once bayonetted by the soldiers. One man was drowned in attempting to hide himself in a well. These, in fact, were all the casualties of yesterday. The villains betrayed each other in every direction; one man, whose name was on the list of an officer, helped to find out thirty criminals, and when he had finished was, to his immense surprise, himself disarmed and arrested as the actual murderer of five persons. The arrests and the delivery up of stolen property have continued all day. Both yesterday and to-day the streets have been almost deserted, and the shops and bazaars closed. A Mussulman, who had some property belonging to a Christian woman delivered to him for safety during the pillage, poisoned the woman with arsenic in some sweetmeats, which he sent her as a present in her concealment. He was executed to-day. This is the first capital sentence as yet carried out by virtue of the authority given to Fuad Pacha. Nazir (?) Pacha and the superior and general officers who have the commission for the summary trial of the prisoners, will not assemble for this purpose for three days yet. I may add that accounts from all parts of

the country, inclusive of Jerusalem and Aleppo, are most satisfactory. The same is reported from the towns along the coast. In fact, the vigour with which Fuad Pacha is acting has already struck terror into the minds of all. It is useless writing you a long letter of description, than which nothing would be easier, with the abundance of materials for 'effect' before me. A few words will say all that need be said in this way now. A bombardment of a month would not have reduced the Christian quarter of Damascus to the state to which the fury of a mob reduced it in a quarter of the time: but few of the walls, even of the houses, remain upright. The gates leading from the Turkish quarter, with the exception of one, are all walled up, and the melancholy desert—peopled only by the butchered dead—is separated from the living city by a chain of military posts. These precautious are used to prevent people from exploring in search of valuables. The dead are supposed to have been all removed, but in more than one spot I have seen here an arm, there a foot, protruding from the charred ruins which were so lately palaces; and at points innumerable, one's olfactories discover other traces of barely concealed bodies, which tell how many yet lie nearly where they fell in the terrible struggle. A great quantity of buried treasure is being dug up daily, the owners being accompanied by a guard and witness to certify that the deposits were found in the place previously described. In the yard of one of the churches there is a deep well; and as the enclosure became crowded with fugitives, and the outward tumult came nearer and nearer, those who had money or jewels flung them into the well. After the massacre, some bodies were also flung into the same well by the mob; and when some days after, a man attempted to descend in search of the jewellery, he was killed by the noxious gasses. Another subsequent attempt proved nearly as fatal; and the treasure, therefore, and its horrible protectors, remained untouched. But enough of the past; the present is this:—The Castle is still crowded with Christians—another convoy of a thousand leaves this evening. All these

people are fed by the government, and the military school and the hospitals have been turned into places of reception by the government medical officers. The arrival of Fuad Pacha, with a large body of troops, on Sunday last, has completely cowed the city, and the wrong-doers see certain punishment staring them in the face. His first piece of conduct on arriving told immensely all over the city. Some tents had been pitched on the plain near Nicca, where the governor of the town and the principal citizens were to receive the imperial deputy. But Fuad, having pushed on before the column of troops, arrived before he was expected. He found, however, the military and civil pacha, and the leading men of the place, together with Abd-el-Kader, awaiting him. He brusquely dismissed the civilians *en masse*, and said he desired only to speak with the military men and the Emir. The others passed out of the tent crest-fallen beyond description—all the more so that many of them were rather more than suspected of complicity in the late barbarities. On Fuad's arriving in the city, however, they all flocked to the Serai, expecting to be received at the Pacha's levee; but here again they were disappointed; the sentries would not let a man of them enter. In dismay they withdrew and held a general meeting—not a frequent event here—to which all the civilians and big wigs of the city were invited. 'Indignation' votes of every sort were mooted. One proposed that all present should remove from the city *en masse* with their families; another that a deputation should be at once sent to Constantinople; another something else; but finally, as was to be expected, nothing was 'carried,' but each man present skulked home to his house, and none of the whole of them have been seen out since. The effect of all on this on the lower classes has been great—they fear that some terrible retribution is coming on them, and are doing all they can each to escape from his well-merited share of it. Every night quantities of furniture, carpets, clothing, and other articles, the produce of the village, are disregarded, and flung secretly into the street. The irregulars, too, are constantly escorting

trains of camels bringing in the plunder found in the neighbouring villages. The forces at present at Damascus appear to be sufficient to assure the Pasha against the consequences of any measures he may undertake for the punishment of the guilty, but as he has done nothing of any moment as yet, he is probably awaiting the arrival of still further reinforcements which are expected at Beyrout to-morrow or the day after. That he will do something serious, however, neither the natives nor the Europeans for a moment doubt—once he has his force in hand. The cause of civilization and toleration has found unexpected allies in the followers of Abd-el-Kader, 400 of whom have been already taken into pay, and 2,000 more have offered their services. The conduct of the Emir and many of his men in protecting the Christians provoked the native Mussulman *canaille* to call them *ghiaours*, and for this they will clear scores if opportunity offers. In short we have all the materials ready mixed for such an explosion as—if not overruled by Fuad—the world has not heard of since the Indian mutiny at all events.

In a letter from the "Times" correspondent from Syria, the latter end of August, the writer asks:—

"What is to be done with the Druses? Fuad Pacha has made a vigorous beginning at Damascus of his work of justice. About 200 executions have taken place, and many more, it is expected, will follow. The mere punishment of the criminals in this affair, however, is the smallest part of the difficulty which encounters us, for what are we to do with the Druses? They declare their intention of retiring into the mountains, and if we let them get there it will be a long piece of business dragging them out of those natural fastnesses, from which Ibrahim Pacha retired with only 9,000 men left out of an army of 40,000. The great Druse Chief, Mohammed el Nasar, the instigator of these butcheries, proclaims openly his contempt of the Sultan, and defies retaliation. This man is a curious specimen of a savage with just a smack of European ideas, and just enough knowledge of European politics

to set him on a wrong tack, and add to his brutality the inspiration of conceit. He sets up as something of a gentleman, and cultivates English acquaintance, so far as a fortress in the mountains enables him to do so. His fortress itself has pretensions to being a palace, and exhibits corridors and galleries, marbles and gilding. He has entertained English travellers quite lately in his chateau, and he does us the honour to have a mighty respect for us. The civilization of these men is only skin deep, and what they know about us, their European stock of ideas, sticks like so much plaster upon the wild aboriginal intellect, with which it refuses to amalgamate, and of which it is only an unsightly, discordant, outside decoration. Nana Sahib was a savage of this stamp—a gentleman savage, who consorted with English officers, and talked like a would-be European. We know how far enlightenment went in his mind. The only use to which, it seems, Mohammed has turned his knowledge of the civilized world, is to start the idea that a massacre of the Maronites would be extremely grateful to England, as being a blow to French interests in Syria. That is just the sort of truth which a barbarian acquires from a smattering of Western life and politics. This man, it appears, really fancied himself a European politician, and thought that he had the head of a cabinet statesman on his shoulders in planning this desperate and horrible scheme of Christian massacre. He counted on English support, and therefore, it need not be added, on an English reward. He had, doubtless, before him the vision of an expanded and exalted tribe; of an alliance of England and the Druses, which would bring the latter out of their barren fastnesses, and introduce them to the luxury and capital of the world; and finally of himself mounting on his tribe's success, and becoming a great man and head of the English party in Syria. What is to be done with the Druses and their chieftans, then, when the Moslems have been hung or shot in sufficient numbers to satisfy justice? That is a much more difficult affair. Fuad Pasha is taking vigorous steps to prevent a retreat to the

mountains, and, if the force which has just left Damascus under the command of Hassan Bey executes its object, these savages will not only be intercepted, but divided, and one-half prevented from communicating with the other. This manœuvre, if it is accomplished, will bring the savages to terms, and the loss of so many heads will follow. But we do not profess to enter on a regular intervention on Syrian affairs now simply as executioners or spectators of executions. What we want to do is to lay down such a plan of administration that such a massacre can never occur again. We want as Christian Powers to guarantee security for the future to the Christian population of Syria. But it will be a great puzzle how to do this without its being of the nature of a permanent interposition in the affairs of Syria. As for the Turkish Government, it has no physical strength, and still less any moral weight, No Turkish Government will ever unteach the Druses the habits of savages and the thirst for blood. They can be made to feel nothing but force, and the only guarantee for the future security of the Christian population will be a constant pressure of European strength upon them in such a shape that they will see that to kill a Christian is to fight with Europe. European power must be felt, in short, as practically as Syrian power, and how to manage this without a permanent intervention in Syria, and a European commission to govern the Pasha is the difficulty which we have to solve."

The *Moniteur*, of the — of August, 1860, contains the protocol of the sitting of the Ambassadorial conference, on the affairs of Syria, held at the Foreign-office, in Paris. The following is a full translation :—

First protocol of the conference held at the Foreign-office, on the 3rd of August, 1860.

His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, being desirous to arrest, by prompt and efficacious measures, the blood-shed in Syria, and to show his firm resolution to insure order and peace among the populations placed under his sovereignty,

And their Majesties, the Emperor of the French, the Em-

peror of Austria, the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, his Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Prussia, and His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, having offered their co-operation, which his Majesty the Sultan has accepted.

The representatives of their above-enumerated Majesties, and of His Royal Highness, have agreed upon the following articles:—

Art. 1. A body of European troops, which may be brought to twelve thousand men, will be directed to Syria, with the view of contributing to the re-establishment of tranquillity.

Art. 2. His Majesty the Emperor of the French consents to furnish immediately, one-half of this number of troops. Should it become necessary to fill up the whole number, as stipulated in the preceding article, the High Powers, without delay, will come to an understanding with the Porte in the ordinary diplomatic way, about the designation of those powers among them which are to make provision for it.

Art. 3. The Commander-in-Chief of the expedition, on his arrival, will enter into communication with the Extraordinary Commissioner of the Porte, for the purpose of combination of the measures required by the circumstances of the case, and for that of taking up what positions may recommend themselves in connection with the fulfilment of the object of the present act.

Art. 4. Their Majesties, the Emperor of the French, the Emperor of Austria, the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Prussia, and His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, promise to furnish (the French is *d'entretenir*) such naval forces as will be sufficient for assisting the success of the common efforts for re-establishing tranquillity on the Syrian shore (*sur le littoral.*)

Art. 5. The high contracting parties, convinced that such a space of time will be sufficient to attain the object of pacifica-

tion they have in view, fix the duration of the occupation by European troops in Syria (sic: *en Syrie*) to six months.

Art. 6. The Sublime Porte undertakes to facilitate as much as will depend upon her the maintenance and provisioning of the expeditionary corps.

It is understood that the six preceding articles are to be transformed into a convention, which shall receive the signatures of the representatives, signers of the present, as soon as they shall have been provided with full powers by their sovereigns, but that the stipulations of this protocol itself are to be in force immediately.

The chargé d'affaires of Prussia, nevertheless, observes, that the present distribution of the Prussian ships of war may not permit his Government to co-operate, for the present, in the execution of Article 4.

Done at Paris, the 3rd of August, 1860, in six different copies.

THOUVENEL,
METTERNICH,
COWLEY,
REUSS KISSELEFF,
AHMED VEFYK.

The following is the second protocol of the conference, held at the Foreign-office, on the 3rd August, 1860:—

The plenipotentiaries of France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, desirous to establish, in conformity with the intentions of their respective courts, the true character of the assistance accorded to the Sublime Porte on the terms of the protocol of this same day, the sentiments which have dictated the clauses of this act, and their complete disinterestedness, declare, in the most formal way, that the contracting Powers neither mean to, nor will pursue, while fulfilling their engagements, any territorial advantage, nor any exclusive influence, nor any concession with regard to the commerce of

their subjects, which would not be conceded to the subjects of all other nations.

Nevertheless, they cannot bring themselves to abstain, in calling back to memory the acts emanated from his Majesty, the Sultan, of which article 9 of the treaty of March 30, 1856, has confirmed the high value, from expressing the importance (*le prix*) which their respective courts attach to the adaptation, in conformity with the solemn promises of the Sublime Porte, of serious administrative measures for ameliorating the fate of the Christian population (*des populations*) of whatever church (*rite*) in the Ottoman empire.

The Plenipotentiary of Turkey takes notice (*prend acte*) of this declaration of the High Powers, and undertakes to transmit it to his court, drawing attention to the fact that the Sublime Porte *has* directed, and will continue to direct, its efforts in the sense of the wish expressed above.

Done at Paris, 3rd August, 1860, in six copies.

THOUVENEL,
METTERNICH,
COWLEY,
REUSS KISSELEFF,
AHMED VEFYK.

Before the other Christian Governments of Europe had fully recovered from the shock which they experienced on suddenly hearing of the unexpected slaughter of the Christians of Lebanon and of Damascus by their old implacable enemies the Druses and the Turks, the Emperor of the French had completed his preparations for sending a military expedition to Syria.

A French division, consisting of infantry, artillery, engineers, and marines, stated to number in all some six thousand men, with a full complement of guns, ammunition, and military stores of all kinds, were ready to sail from Marseilles for the coast of Syria, in the beginning of August, to be followed in due course by other detachments.

The first body of French troops landed at Beyrout on the 16th of August, 1860.

The correspondent of a London journal writes from Beyrout the 10th of September, 1860:

EXECUTION OF ACHMET PACHA AT DAMASCUS.

An express from Damascus reached Beyrout to-day to say that on Saturday, the 8th instant, Achmet Pacha, late Governor General of Damascus, together with three other superior officers of the Turkish army (all deeply concerned in the late massacres), were shot by order of Fuad Pacha. The sentence was that of the military court-martial by which they were tried. The three other officers executed are Osman Bey, the miscreant who, being in command of the Turkish troops at Hasbeiya when the Druses attacked the place, first persuaded the whole Christian population of the town to go into the Serai, or Government House, promising them protection. He then made them give up to him as the representative of the Sultan's government, all their arms, and when this was done—when all the Christian inhabitants, to the amount of some two thousands, were perfectly at his mercy—he let in the Druses, by whom every man and every male child was ruthlessly butchered in cold blood—Osman Bey's troops helping in the fearful tragedy, and adding to the measure of their iniquity by ill-treating and violating many of the women. The next on the list Ali Bey, was, like Osman Bey, a colonel in the Turkish army. He it was who, being in command of the troops in the streets of Damascus on the 9th of July, when the disturbance broke out, instead of using the ample means he had to put down the insurrection, suffered his fanatical zeal to get the better of his judgment, and allowed his men to help the mob. The latter thus taking courage proceeded from bad to worse, the ruffian rabble raised the cry that the troops were with them, and the result was as we know, the massacre of five thousand Christians. The last

executed was Mustapha Bey, of whom it is enough to say that he behaved at Rasheiya exactly the same as Osman Bey did at Hasbeiya, and with the same results. All three—Osman Ali, and Mustapha—were Turkish colonels; all three acted as worthy lieutenants of their infamous superior, Achmet—and all three have suffered death with him. Lord Dufferin arrived here from Constantinople on Sunday, the 2nd inst; Monday, the 3rd, he remained all day in conference with Admiral Martin and Mr. Moore, the Consul General; Tuesday he started for Damascus arriving there late on Thursday. The next day he had a long interview with Fuad Pacha, and on Saturday the execution of the four fanatical traitors took place. Judging from these followings of events, it is but natural to conclude that it was his lordship's firmness that caused Fuad to carry out the sentence on the culprits.

One and all of the Druses—sheiks and peasants—are, as well they may be, in a very great fright for the future. They feel that, with few exceptions, they have called down upon themselves the vengeance of the Christian powers, and bitterly openly regret the madness which made them join hands with the Turks for the extermination of the Christians. *Nor do they mince matters when they speak of the Ottoman government, which, as they now begin to see, has first made use of them, and now wants to turn them adrift.* They say, that if called upon to give testimony before any honest commission, they will give such evidence, and such proof, as will yet open the eyes of all Europe. But they make two stipulations—first, that no Turkish official should be a member of the commission; and, secondly, that at least one Englishman have a voice and vote in its proceedings. Strange to say, the Druse chief, who appears certainly the most implicated of all those on the mountain in those fearful massacres is, or appears to be, a certain Sheik Syad Bey Djemblat, of Mooktara, the wealthiest landowner in all Syria, and one who made a great profession of being a friend of Englishmen. During the time of the Egyptian government, the father of this chief was exiled, and he himself made to serve

as a common soldier in the Egyptian army. It was by English influence alone, that he was brought back to the Lebanon, and restored to his heritage. If this man did not join, it is certain his immense influence could have prevented the fearful massacres which have lately taken place in and around the Lebanon. But I fear he is deeply in the dirt. One of his kayaihs, or deputy-governors, was the presiding genius at the massacre of Deir-el-Kammar, a fiend in human shape, called Ali Bey Hamaddee, a scoundrel who fought well, and gained his title of Bey at Kars. Whilst another of Syad Bey's deputies, called Cassim Yeseph, plundered and burnt the very wealthy convent of Der Mohalis, besides conducting the massacres at Sidon. Both these men are up to their very chins in murder and plunder, yet their superior, Syad Bey Djemblat, is trying hard to make the world here believe that he, without whose orders neither of these men would have dared to move a hand, is perfectly innocent.

A very large body of the Turkish prisoners passed through Beyrout the other day, singing one of the refrains of the Druse war song, "how sweet it is to shed the blood of Christians;" but the next batch, which arrived three nights ago, were escorted to the barracks by a detachment of French hussars, who have rather different notions about the propriety of prisoners' behaviour than have the Turkish regular troops. May God grant I may never again see such a sight as I witnessed three days ago at Deir-el-Kammar! and such would be the prayer of any man who has been in that town since the massacre.—Although the place was under the special government of the Sultan, no effort whatever has been made to bury the dead, even at this date of two months and a half after the tragedy. What has been done to hasten the disappearance of human bodies has been effected by the dogs, and wolves, and jackals of the surrounding districts. It was a fearful scene. Here stood, ninety days ago, a thriving town of 8,000 souls and upwards, and when the troubles in Lebanon broke out, nearly 2,000 Christians from various parts had sought refuge in the

place. Where are now those images of God? Where are the comfortable homes, the thriving trades, the rich silk crops, the produce of grapes and olives, the hundreds of working silk looms that this population possessed? Where are the wives and daughters of these traders and landowners, where the happy children, the hearty welcome which all strangers received, the wealth in dress and jewels with which the matrons were adorned? The men of the place—ay, and some of the women, too, for I counted no less than a dozen in one spot—the men are here, these corrupting masses of putrid skulls are all that remains of them; their houses are all burnt or pulled down; their property all plundered or destroyed; their women beggars in the streets of Beyrout; their male children hacked to pieces by the knives of the Druses. Amongst so many horrors it was difficult to select one place more fearful than another, but the Maronite Church and the Turkish Governor's divan, or receiving room, exceeded all I could have believed possible. The former is surrounded by a small court yard, the door of which was shut. When we opened it the stench was something hardly to be conceived. On the pavement in front of the church, to which a large portion of the inhabitants had evidently fled for shelter, the dead bodies lay literally heaped in dozens one upon another, as they had been murdered and flung down. The steps up to the church are white, and down them was a broad purple mark of twenty or thirty feet long, from the interior of the altar rails out far beyond the door, which told but too plainly the tale of murder. The body of the church is about the size of the Lock Chapel, in the Harrow-road, the court-yard is broader, but about half its length. But in no part of that church, on no inch of that court, could any man, put he his steps ever so nicely, walk without putting his foot on some part or other of a dead man's body. The skeletons are, with few exceptions, perfectly naked, for every survivor of the massacre that I have questioned—and more than a hundred have related the same tale to various parties in Beyrout—say, so cold-blooded were the Druses in their murderous work, that,

before butchering a man, whose clothes were at all good, they first made him undress himself, and then hacked him to pieces with their long knives, thus preserving his garments uncut and unstained by blood. For some reason or other, however, they appear not to have taken the Maronite priests' clothes, as I observed many of the corpses clad in the black coarse gown of the monks. The church and court-yard were strewn with torn church books and broken church ornaments; but here, as everywhere else all that could be turned to the slightest use, even to the wooden lintels of the doors and the frames of the windows, had been taken away by the marauding hordes of murderers. But even more than by the sight of the Maronite church, was I astonished and sickened on going into the Turkish Governor's room, in the far interior of the Serai. Here the great slaughter seems to have taken place. Here—two and a half months after these murders—the ground of the room was still discoloured and fat with human blood. Here still lay about fragments of torn dresses and clothing, bearing witness of many fearful deeds of blood. And here, below the large window of the room, lay heap upon heap and pile upon pile of corrupting human bodies, a seething mass of advanced putrefaction. Here, too, were torn mass books and gospels in numbers, and also many pages of a well printed edition of "Fenelon's Life," in French, showing that in this, the government house, no doubt some of the better educated Christian community had sought a refuge, but had found a grave. My very soul sickened at all I had seen, and I left the town sooner than I otherwise would had I remained to see everything that bore witness to the bloodthirstyness of the Druses, or the iniquitous treachery of the Turks. On both may the sentence come of "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

The writer of the foregoing letter was much mistaken about the certainty of the Druses *surrendering to a man.* Neither threats nor blandishments have had any effect on the majority of them in the way of inducement to repair to the head-quarters of Fuad Pacha.

If the Druse Chiefs were innocent of the murders of Deir-el-Kammar, Hasbeya, and Rasheya, if they could prove their hands were guiltless of Christian blood, and their castles unenriched with Christian spoil, Lord Dufferin would have exerted the great power and authority with which he was invested, to protect the chiefs of a people who, according to Lord Carnarvon, are the fast friends of England. Only a few, however, came down to abide that "impartial trial" which they sought. They sullenly refused to give any account of their participation in the massacres which have filled the world with horror, and if any foreign army landed on the Syrian coast they would mince it up just as they did the unsuspecting inhabitants of the convent of the Moon! But their threats soon sunk into fear when French soldiers appeared on the scene. All their boasting evaporated in presence of the few thousands of troops sent out by the French Government. They fled at the first approach of danger, and prepared to escape into the Hauran, which served them so often before as a refuge. This district, bounded on the north by the Anti-Libanus, and on the south and east by the desert, is the mountain fortress of the Druses. There the Lebanon Sheiks and their followers have always found shelter when hard pushed on the south, and there they have now forced their way, joined their brethren in the Hauran, and escaped by the connivance of the Turkish soldiers. It was determined by the French and Turkish authorities to force Druse fastnesses, and bring the chiefs to bay. It was a formidable proceeding, and the wise heads at Beyrout contemplated calamitous results to the expeditionary columns. The Druses were armed to the teeth. Their position was impregnable, and their guns long of carriage and fatal in precision. While they were collecting the vast wealth plundered from the Christians, and before they could store it away in the Hauran, two columns, one French, and the other Turkish, started from two points on the coast, Sidon and Beyrout. These were to advance over the Lebanon, driving before them the Druses, whilst two other Turkish brigades were to push out from

Damascus, spread along the Cœlo-Syrian valley, and, whilst interposing between the Druses and the Hauran, force them back on the columns advancing from the coast. This plan was well arranged, and if properly carried out would have resulted in success. The French column, commanded by General D'Hautpoul, and the Turkish by Ismail Pacha, the Hungarian Kmety, consisting of four thousand French and six thousand Turks, did their work well. The Druses fled before them, and breaking up into small bodies as they advanced, soon came on the Turkish brigades stationed to prevent their escape into the Hauran. Between these brigades the flying Druses passed without molestation.

Consul-General Moore, in a despatch to Sir H. Bulwer from Beyrout, dated 30th June, 1860, when the Massacres of Damascus and several other places in the Lebanon had not taken place, gives the following "approximate estimate of the result of the civil war in the Lebanon up to the present time," that is to say up to June 30, 1860:

Christian villages burnt . . .	150
Christians killed in warfare, 500; do. massacred, 5,500 . . .	6,000
Christian sufferers by the war . .	75,000

Of the 75,000 sufferers above mentioned 15,000 widows and orphans are computed to exist.

Consul Brant estimates the number massacred in Damascus the 18th July, 1860, at 2,000, and the value of the property plundered and destroyed, at £1,000,000 sterling.

Mr. Graham, in his letter to Lord Dufferin from Beyrout, dated 11th July, 1860, estimates the number massacred at Der-el-Kammar at from 1,000 to 1,200; at Hasbeya and Rasheya, 700, at Sidon, 550, near Beyrout on 30th and 31st May, refugees from the mountains, 200, and in the several villages about 1,000, total 3,650.

But the number massacred in Damascus on the 11th July, 2,000, is not taken into account by Mr. Graham in his dispatch of the 18th of July. This addition to his estimate would make

the numbers of the massacred 5,650. But he has greatly under-rated the number of the massacred at Hasbeyah and Rasheyak. Instead of 700 it should have been 1,000 at least. This would make the number the same as Mr. Moore's estimate.

The persons massacred were all males.

The loss to predial labour in the Maronite community must consequently have been the more severely felt.

But none of the Consuls, or other persons who have made reports on these raides and massacres, make any estimate of the number of women and young children captured by the Druses, carried into slavery, and who still, to the great disgrace of the Turkish Government, remain in slavery.

The people who committed these terrible atrocities, the Druses of the Lebanon, have perpetrated them with entire impunity, not a single Druse chief, up to this date, thanks to an effectual intervention in their behalf with Fuad Pacha, on the part of Lord Dufferin and Sir H. Bulwer, with the Porte, has suffered the penalty of his crimes.

Very uncommon pains have been taken (strange to say by persons who could have no interest in defeating the ends of justice) to screen the Druses from the chastisement they so well deserved for their wholesale murders, pillages, and captures of women and children. Nay, these persons have gone to the extent of preventing the surviving Maronites from proceeding against them for the recovery of the property carried away by the marauders, by entering into what they call treaties of peace with them and undertaking to indemnify them for the past, and to exempt them for the future from any proceedings against them on account of their late murders and robberies.

This was done by Mr. Consul General Moore, of Beyrout, no doubt with the best intentions, and thus has this treaty making proceeding been viewed by a brave and noble minded British naval officer, Captain Paynter.

In a despatch dated July 13th, 1860: "A treaty of peace between the Druses under the auspices of the Turkish autho-

rities was signed yesterday. A few only of the principal Christian chiefs have attached their signatures. 'Oblivion for the past!' 'Non surrender of plunder!' And 'no indemnification for property destroyed!' forms the ground work of this treaty."*

When the mission to the Druses was adopted by Consul General Moore and his colleagues, and a treaty of peace proposed to them in a letter which Mr. Moore addressed to one of the principal Druse Shieks, Ismail-el-Ataash when he refers to this chief's recently attacking Zahlee, and committing, as reported to Mr. Moore, barbarous cruelties against the Christians at several places, he adds:

"I never thought that any Druse chief would have committed such barbarous cruelties at the time the English nation used to think that the Druses are as remarkable for bravery on the field of battle, and legitimate warfare as they are for chivalry and magnanimity in the cause of humanity."†

Heaven defend us and all our tribe from such bravery on the field of battle in legitimate warfare, such chivalry and magnanimity at the call of humanity as the Druse chieftains displayed in the massacres of the Maronites, with whose blood their swords were reeking, at the very time that they are reminded of that chivalry and magnanimity for which they are so remarkable!

Consul Finn, of Jerusalem, followed the example of Consul General Moore, at Beyrout.

He prevailed on a Mr. Peter Meshullam to go on a peace-making mission to the Druses in the beginning of July, 1860, and at Moktara this gentleman harrangued the assembled Druses, in terms that could not fail to make them think very highly of the lofty position in which they stood in the estimation of the English nation.

One passage was to the following effect: "You Druses say

* See Parliamentary Papers, No. 21.
† See Parliamentary Papers, No. 13.

that the English have got a great interest in you, and that they are your friends; do you think it proper to trouble them because they are your friends. Would you like them to enter into a war with some other European nation for your sake, and have 50,000 or 60,000 of their best men killed, and you to be the cause? *The Turkish Government may not seem to blame you for this last war, as it appears to them, by the documents in your hands, that the Christians commenced it*, and would not stop it till you had utterly destroyed their best villages, and killed their best men; but other nations may lay the blame on both yourselves and the Government."*

How tenderly the atrocities of the murderous Druse banditti, are dealt with by this messenger of peace on the mission he was sent by Mr. Consul Finn.

It is a great pity that Mr. Consul Finn, who must have some legitimate consular duties to perform, should give himself all this trouble with Mr. Peter Meshullam, and his unauthorized, bombastic mission to the Druses. The mission that was consulted or called for to them was one of military force for the purpose of chastisement and not of cajolery.

The Maronites were not represented by him or by Mr. Consul General Moore and his colleague, when they undertook to propose the terms of peace that were to be entered into by them and the Maronites, without a single stipulation for the restitution of the property they had robbed, and the restoration of the women and children they had carried away, after the massacre of their friends and relatives, into slavery.

If the Druses had been engaged in a great defensive war carried on in the way that modern warfare is waged, they could not be addressed in terms more calculated to make them feel they had been engaged in a legitimate struggle in this "last war" of theirs with the Maronites. Not one word of indignation is expressed at the horrible butcheries they have been just committing, not one syllable of advice to them is uttered

* See Parliamentary Papers, No. 27.

to give back the property they had lately plundered, to restore the women and children of the unfortunate Maronites they had so cruelly butchered in cold bold. But on the contrary, they are made to believe they are greatly beloved by the English nation, and highly prized for their valour and good behaviour.

All the spirits that tend on mortal thoughts, whose aim is evil were surely busy with the brains of those remorseless pagan Druses, when they engaged in this bloody work of direst cruelty the latter end of May, 1860, and persisted in it till the middle of July following.

> "No compunctious visitings of nature
> Shook their fell purpose, nor kept peace between
> The effect and it."

The "murth'ring ministers," who wait on natures mischief, tended on them morning, noon, and night, stalked about them in their dreams, haunted their imaginations in their waking moments, hounding them on, continuously to carnage, shouting in their ears incessantly—kill, kill, kill, and pointing out the victims who were to be slain—the Christians, who were Rayahs.

In modern times no calamities have been recorded so terrible to think of as those massacres, the horrors of which have been described by Consul Brant, of Damascus, Consul General Moore of Beyrout, and Mr. Graham in their accounts of the frightful atrocities perpetrated at Sour, Rasheya and several other places.

If ever wretched people in our times had awful experience of afflictions on afflictions suddenly and swiftly, as one flash of lightning following another, falling on them without preparation, defence, or shelter, "so that whoever shall hear of them their ears shall tingle," it surely was the Maronites. No other people in our days could so fully comprehend as the survivors of this recent carnage of Christians, the words of lamentation—

"Teach your daughters wailings and every one her neighbour mourning.

"For death is come up through your windows, to destroy the children without, the young men from the streets.

"Speak, thus saith the Lord: even the carcases of men shall be as dung upon the face of the country, and as grass behind the back of the mower and there is none to gather it."*

The Turks in Damascus, Hasbeya, and Rasheya, have dealt with the survivors of the Maronites, in strict accordance with the principles of their religion. And really, when we read the comments on those massacres of some Christians, and notice their efforts to vindicate the murderous Druses and to inculpate their slaughtered, defenceless victims, the Maronites, we almost feel as if the victors were encouraged to renew the work not wholly accomplished on the Lebanon. What is all this eulogising of the valour and magnanimity of the Druses since the perpetration of their recent atrocities on the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the mountain, but language that will be interpreted into encouragement, as much so as if we said to them, of their remaining victims whose doom had been postponed, in so many plain, distinct, and out spoken words:—

"Therefore deliver up their children to famine, and bring them into the hands of the sword: let their wives be bereaved of children and become widows: and let their husbands be slain by death: let their young men be stabbed with the sword in battle."†

How comes it then, that our sympathies would really seem by the reports of our newspaper correspondents sent home from Syria, of the very inadequate measures taken for the punishment of the actors in those scenes of blood, and the comments on them in the House of Commons to be greater for the Druses, the sanguinary wretches by whom these butcheries were made, than for the Maronites; their disarmed, defenceless, unprepared, and unresisting victims.

True it is the Maronites were Roman Catholics and the

* Jerem., chap. ix. v. 19 to 22.

† Jerem., chap. xviii. v. 21.

Druses, by whom they were massacred in cold blood, were not. The latter were only pagans.

Nevertheless, members of the Church of Rome though these Maronites were, they were human beings, and in the carnage of them, humanity was outraged and religion offended, quite as grievously as if the massacred people were enrolled on the lists of proselytes (those lists of marvellously augmented numbers so demonstrative of the fact that miracles are performed in our days by pious Arithmeticians) lists that are periodically returned from Syria by the missionaries, who are connected with Bible Societies in England.

Does humanity recognise one law of sympathy for the wronged and outraged members of a particular church and another law of commiseration for the cruelly injured community of a different religious denomination?

Does the mode of worshipping God determine the way that Christians of any Church are to deal with the most terrible of all calamities that can befall or have befallen our fellow Christians of another?

In modern times, the cruelties committed by slave dealers on the coast of Africa, caused even the introduction into our official vocabulary of such epithets as "miscreants," "monsters," "enemies of the human race," &c., &c.; for with such epithets we find the parliamentary slave trade papers teem. The atrocites, however, committed in Syria on the Maronites who were more immediately entitled to British sympathy, because in point of religious relationship they were bound to us in closer bonds of Christian fellowship, deserved, in my humble opinion, to be placed in the same category of crimes, as those in which are recorded the atrocities of the Spaniards and Portuguese, and to be ranked among the worst outrages on humanity that have ever been committed.

I have elsewhere had occasion to observe, that we are as fully subject as the people of any other country on the face of the earth to the fitful influence of that variable atmosphere of the

feelings which modifies our notions of Christian benevolence, and carries a spirit of conventional Christianity into our dealings with the wrongs and grievances which are brought before us, which at one period and for one class of sufferers enlivens sensibility, and at another time and for another description of unfortunates, stifles every emotion of compassion.

In all the massacres in May, June, and the early part of July, 1860, perpetrated by the Druses, one fact was indubitable, that they were connived at by the Turkish Authorities in all instances; nay, generally speaking secretly encouraged, and in several cases actively assisted by their subordinates and the soldiers at their disposal. This fact was subsequently so well known to Fuad Pacha, the Turkish Commissioner, sent into Syria by the Sultan, that he put to death some forty Turkish officials including Achmed Pacha, the late Governor-General of Damascus, and three superior military officers, colonels, Osman Bey, the most infamous of the wholesale murderers of Christians. who turned the force at his orders against the inhabitants of Hasbeyah, Ali Bey the commandant of the troops in Damascus on the fatal 9th of July, who allowed his soldiers to assist the mob murderers, and Mustapha Bey another Turkish commandant, who acted at Rasheyah as Osman Bey had done at Hasbeyah, Yet British State-craft ignores the fact, that in the late massacres, a large portion of the carnage was the work of Turks.

From a statement made in the House of Commons, on the 19th of July, 1860, respecting the Syrian massacres, it would appear his lordship thought it was a general impression that the Turks had not done *all* they could do to stop these massacres.

" Sir J. Fergusson called the attention of the house to an article in the *Constitutionnel*, giving an account of the steps taken by the French Government to put a stop to the massacre of the Christians in Syria, and asked Lord J. Russell whether he had taken any part, in his position of Foreign Secretary, to prevent the continuance of the terrible massacres; he also asked whether it was true that peace had been agreed to between the tribes of Lebanon, and whether her Majesty had

consented to the intervention of the French Government in Syria.

"Lord J. Russell said it was the general impression that the Turks had not done all they could to stop these massacres, although it was true that the Sultan had sent a considerable body of troops into the disturbed districts. Her Majesty's Government could not object to European troops being sent to Syria, and a convention for that purpose had been signed, to which England, France, Russia, Austria, and Prussia were parties. It was not yet ascertained what steps the Porte would take."

The universal feeling of horror and indignation excited in France by the intelligence of the massacres perpetrated by the Druses and Turks in Syria, and of sympathy for the sufferings of the unfortunate Maronite Christians of the Lebanon, I had an opportunity of witnessing.

The intensity and universality of that feeling in every class of the French people on that occasion, it would be difficult to exaggerate, and it was natural that it should be so, the people who were butchered by Druses and Turks were co-religionists of the French people. In England it cannot be understood that Louis Napoleon was driven, no less by that strongly prevailing feeling of sympathy with the Maronites, than by the obligations imposed on him by treaties of French sovereigns (so early as the time of St. Louis) with Turkish rulers, conferring the privileges of a protectorate over the Maronites, on the sovereigns of France, and was forced by his position to take effectual measures for their protection in their present deplorable circumstances.

Looking, as our Consuls do in the Levant, on the Druses as friends and allies by feelings, though not by treaties with England, it is not to be wondered at that their reports mislead their superiors, and that in proportion as the Maronites are sympathised with in France, the Druses are favourably regarded in England, and their excesses on various grounds exused.

It was high time for some European Power to stand forward

on behalf of humanity so terribly outraged as it had been in Syria in the persons of the Maronite Christians of the Lebanon, when Louis Napoleon first determined on an expedition to Syria, and then invited the other Great Powers to a Conference in Paris on the subject of the proposed expedition.

In a letter from Beirout, dated 31st December, 1860, the correspondent of the *Daily News*, referring to the trials of the Druse prisoners, observes:—

"The chief sheiks are mostly, if not all, *condemned to death*, whilst the Turkish authorities—Koorchid Pacha, Tir Pacha, and about twenty minor officials—escape with comparatively slight punishment; that is, they are ordered to be exiled, which in Turkey means a few months of quiet life in country retirement, then leave to reside on the Bosphorus, and final reinstatement in some new, perhaps a better, appointment. In fact, it means such a fate as befel Namik Pacha, who, three years ago, was pretty deeply implicated in the affair of Jedda, and is now one of the Sultan's Ministers.

"At the Porte, heaven and earth is being moved to save Koorchid and Tir Pacha, the former being a personal friend of the Sultan, the latter the son-in-law of Namik Pacha, the hero of Jedda. To save them, all the Turks implicated in the late disturbances and massacres must be also saved. Compare the state of these unfortunate Druses with that of hundreds of the Moslems who took part in the Damascus massacre. They were seized as conscripts, and sent to Constantinople, where all who could muster the money, upon paying 13,000 piastres (about £100) were at once released, and are now gentlemen at large. Many have returned to Syria, others are sauntering about in Stamboul, boasting of how they slaughtered the Christian men, dishonoured the Chistian women, burnt the Christians' houses, and stole the Christians' money. In fact, a large portion of the proceeds of the plunder in that doomed town, has been used to buy off the scoundrels who were sent as conscripts to the army."

It has been unfortunate for the character of our consistency

in the advocacy of the interests of humanity that so many occasions in the past year have been taken in high places, in Parliament and the Press of defending the perpetrators of those massacres, of representing most untruly the unhappy victims of the Druses as the originators of the conflicts in which they were slaughtered, and in representing the conduct of the Maronites in such odious colours, and that of the Druses in a light so calculated to gain sympathy for them, that the effect of this course is to shield them altogether, as it has done up to the present time, from the punishment they so richly deserved.

The following will serve for an example of the policy I refer to.

In the House of Lords, Monday, February, 26, 1861, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, in pursuance of notice, proceeded to move for correspondence connected with certain events in Syria.

Lord Wodehouse in reply said his noble friend had not exaggerated the importance of events in Syria. The course taken by the Turkish Government, and the Great Powers acting through the French Government, had been of great service in checking the disturbance, and the Turkish Government had shown great energy in punishing the offenders. Nine hundred and twenty persons had been brought to justice for their crimes and condemned, and of those fifty-six were executed, in addition to the commander-in-chief and three other officers who were shot. Measures were taken to capture the principal Druse chiefs, and though many of them escaped, some of the most important offenders were captured and put on their trial at Beyrout. The Lebanon had been occupied with Turkish troops, but during that occupation, he regretted to state, the Christians took the opportunity to revenge themselves on their opponents, and massacred 136 persons, of whom twenty-five were women and eighty-six children. To show the spirit which actuated the Maronites towards the Druses, he might mention that the bishops furnished to the commissioner a list of 4,500 males whom they required should be put to death, although the entire Druse male population amounted

to only 11,000; and on the list being sent back as too large, the bishops furnished a new one of 1,200. Under such circumstances, the work of carrying out justice, mingled with mercy, had been no easy one to go through. He hoped his noble friend would withdraw his motion.

How comes it to pass, I would venture to ask Lord Wodehouse, if the Turkish authorities and Turkish troops in Syria had done their duty, that from the day the massacres commenced, ten months ago, to the present hour, not one of the chiefs of the Druse murderers has been executed.

It is very unfortunate for the exercise of our influence in Syria, that our consuls should allow themselves to become the exponents of the views and opinions of our missionaries in Syria, rather than of British imperial interests, that the Druses should be taken up as our pet race in Syria and our *protégés*, and that the Maronites, Roman Catholic though they be, should be looked upon with such disfavour, and meet with very scant justice at the hands of our consular agents, and in the speeches of those who have to deal with their reports.

In the House of Commons on Monday, the 20th of August, 1861, there was a conversation on Syrian affairs, the substance of which is as follows:—

Mr. Monsell drew the attention of Lord Palmerston to the statement he had made the other day. The noble lord had said that the hostilities in Syria were commenced not by the Druses, but by the Maronites, and he endeavoured to exonerate the Turkish Government from any blame in the transaction.

Lord Palmerston said it was not by any means desirable that the Turkish Empire should be dismembered, a consummation which the hon. member appeared to approve of; but he did not say to which foreign Power he would have that empire transferred. There was no doubt much to be complained of with regard to the Turkish rule, and it was not from any regard for the Turkish character that he was opposed to any such dismemberment, but because it would lead, if not to an European war, to consequences of a very serious description. He (Lord

Palmerston) contended that the Maronites had commenced the disturbances, and he referred to the statements of Lord Cowley and other competent persons in support of that assertion. Although some of the Turkish authorities and officers acted in the way described, the conduct of the Turkish Government subsequent to the disturbances, proved that it was not favourable to the cause of the Druses in regard to these disturbances.

Lord Palmerston was certainly lamentably misinformed by our consular agents in Syria with respect to the hostilities being commenced by the Maronites.

The subject of the Syrian massacres is of too vast and too lasting an importance to be glanced at merely in passages of letters, or articles in newspapers. It is necessary the history of these massacres should be compared with the official documents on this subject that bear on the face of them a certain stamp of authenticity in the Parliamentary papers presented to the House of Commons, in two separate reports made to the order for their production on the 30th of June, 1860, and the latest of them in April, 1861.

These official documents have been examined with no ordinary care and assiduity by the author.

Much is to be learned from them, and a great deal to be dealt with as matter calculated to mislead and to misinform.

Although these official papers are in the mass the most reliable of all accounts of these deplorable occurrences, several of them are to be received with caution, and remembrance of the fact, that the writers of them have been on intimate terms, nay, in close relations of intimacy and of confidence with the Druses, and had no sympathies with their adversaries of the Roman Catholic Church.

The art of ingeniously suffocating a subject of vast importance in a mass of official correspondence, has never been illustrated more clearly and cleverly too, than in the last production of "Correspondence Relating to the Affairs of Syria," presented to parliament in April, 1861. The correspondence dates from the 5th of July, 1860, to the 22nd of March 1861.

The International Commissioners, employed to inquire into the Syrian massacres, &c., at the latter date had nearly brought their labours to a close. It is really to be feared, however, they have settled nothing. The ends of justice have not been satisfied. The Druses remain unpunished, and no sufficient guarantee has been obtained from the Turkish Government for the protection and security of the Christian Maronites from renewed massacres.

The scheme of Government for the administration of affairs in Syria, drawn up by Lord Dufferin and proposed to his Government, is utterly impracticable; it has no executive principle in it. No adequate concessions have been obtained from the Porte for their maltreated Syrian subjects. No guarantees for good government have been exacted and made a *sine quâ non* of the withdrawal of the foreign force from Syria.

An admirable letter of Colonel Churchill, whose work entitled "Ten Years in the Lebanon," seven or eight years ago gave the best extant account of the modern Druses, appeared in *The London Examiner* of the 20th of April, 1861.

SIR,—The unanimous declaration of the survivors from the late massacres is, "the Government killed us." The bare idea of being left under the direct rule of the Ottoman Turks fills them with horror and despair. The voice of Christianity, of humanity, and civilisation demands, trumpet-tongued, that such direct rule should cease. Up to the present moment, the feelings of dread and insecurity, which have agitated the Christian population of Syria for these last ten months, remain unabated. In Damascus the Christians are still menaced and insulted. Crosses of wood are still made, thrown into the mire, and trampled upon. The few thousands who remained in that city during the past winter were preparing to abandon it. Already numerous families have arrived at Beyrout. Nothing can persuade them to remain.

In the Lebanon the Druses, encouraged by the strange impunity which has as yet attended their hideous atrocities, have assumed towards the unfortunate Christians still exposed to

their tender mercies a more menacing attitude than ever. They go about singing their war songs with an air of vindictive triumph, hold out threats of further slaughter, and tauntingly tell them, "we have kept all our plunder, and have trampled on your cross." The few families who ventured back to Hasbeya and Rascheya have been compelled to abandon them and have fled down to the coast. The Druses now openly wear the clothes of their victims. They go about armed up to the teeth. The Christians are hardly allowed to carry a knife. And, as before the war, the Druses and the Turkish soldiers quartered in the principal villages, live on terms of the closest friendship and alliance. Both look on the Christians with supercilious and ferocious scorn, as tyrants on their slaves. The French occupation, volunteered by the Emperor Napoleon, and sanctioned by the common consent of Europe, alone gave the Christians assurance, kept up their drooping spirits, and excited their hopes. To withdraw it ere they had a certainty of safety and security afforded them must be looked on as a moral crime. Justice and mercy alike proclaimed the imperious necessity of its continuance. In such a cause all national jealousies should cease. It was useless to limit it to three months, to six months, or to twelve. Its sacred mission was to save the Christian communities of Syria from impending dangers, to give them a form of Government, and to surround them with such guarantees as might enable them henceforth to live without hourly dread of assassination, of insult, and outrage, if not to flourish and prosper. When that mission was accomplished, and not till then, could the occupation cease, as it began, with honour."

Three plans have been propounded for such an administration in Syria, as might be reasonably expected to secure the advantages above mentioned. If the welfare of the whole province were to be considered, the plan ultimately adopted of Lord Dufferin and the European commissioners left much to be desired that would completely and efficiently answer all the purposes required.

The first propositions included a Mohammedan Governor-

General, approved of by the Christian Powers, who were to be represented by political agents accredited to the seat of Government, and empowered to co-operate in the general administration of the province; Abolition of the Feudal system; a national army of 25,000 men to be levied from all the various sects. Each sect to have its local Police force; a Christian Governor for the Lebanon, including Druses and Maronites, and other Christian sects residing within its limits.

Such were their leading features. The Christian communities, under such a regime, would be assured of consideration and protection. A loan of two millions sterling would be necessary to carry it into effect, for which the security of the revenues of the province would be amply sufficient. A European occupation of at least a year from the date of its inauguration would be necessary, during which the drilling and organization of the national army might be completed under the direction of European officers and non-commissioned officers. The better to effect this object, as it would strictly promote the design of the intervention, in the terms therein laid down, full efficiency should be immediately given to article 1 of the Protocol signed at Paris on the 3rd of August, 1860, which provided that—

A body of European troops which may be increased to 12,000 men, shall be sent to Syria, to contribute towards the establishment of tranquillity.

"It is clear (says Colonel Churçhill) there can be no tranquillity for the Christians in any true sense of the word, until such a government is established as will afford them good prospects of tranquillity for the future as well as for the present. Failing of achieving this end, the European occupation might as well never have taken place. To achieve it, not an hour short of one full year, as above mentioned will be sufficient. The effective French force in Syria under General Beaufort d'Hautpool is from 6,000 to 7,000 men. Let the requisite 12,000 men be completed by English troops. If not by English, by Prussian. All Turkish

troops should be at once withdrawn from the Pashalicks of Damascus and Sidon.

"If Fuad Pacha would frankly and cordially accept and act with the European element, civil, and military, thus introduced into the province, he might safely be made Governor-General and Commander-in-chief over Syria; for the two functions ought to be combined in his person. He is tolerant, fearless, laborious, energetic. Give him ample means, tell him to do the work, and he will do it. But he must be entirely free from all political connexion with Constantinople. Let him pay tribute no more. Any constrained subservience to that sink of fanaticism, corruption and intrigue, would be to render good government impossible. He would ere long throw up his hands in despair. If there exists no "arriére pensée" amongst the European Powers as to the future of Syria, if they really and sincerely wish for the welfare of its Christian races, and at the same time, to secure the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire, let them go into this scheme at once and carry it out.

"Another plan is to create a Christian Principality of which Mount Lebanon should be the centre, with a seaboard, including the seaports of Tyre, Sidon, Beyrout, and Tripoli: and inland comprising the plains of Baalbec and the Bekan, with the Anti-Lebanon. The institutions and the local governors in the principality to be Christian, with a Christian military force of 8,000 men. The governor to be an Emir of the family of Shehaab. The Christians in other parts of Syria, if dissatisfied with their position, to congregate here as to a common asylum. Damascus to be left entirely to the Mohammedans. The plan is worthy of consideration. It certainly holds out good prospects for the Christians. With rights and privileges guaranteed to them by the European Powers, they would quickly exhibit a healthful commercial activity; towns now in ruins would be rebuilt, roads and canals would be made, their condition, to use the well-known but hitherto futile and unmeaning phrase, "would be ameliorated."

To this plan it has been objected that it would be simply creating a French province, "un département du Haut Leban." The objection is not altogether groundless. A Maronite Emir, whatever may be his outward professions, indeed however good his intentions, must fall more or less, from his birth, from his education, and from his associations, under the influence of the Maronite priesthood. The latter are notoriously the great promoters of French influence and French views, political and ecclesiastical, and whenever their advice and councils are adopted by the civil power, a grasping and bigoted intolerance is sure to make itself felt in all parts of the administration, and a stern resistance to that freedom of thought and action which is so essential to the formation and existence of a happy and well-regulated community. Should this plan excite the jealousy of England, and not unnaturally, while it has attractions for France, let the latter, if she is really disinterested in her views, consent to the governor of such principality being a European and a Protestant, holding his investiture, his rank, and his office, from the Sultan. The sphere of government being more circumscribed, the military force to be organized so much smaller, the European occupation under this project would not need to be extended to more than half a year instead of one.

Whether either the one or the other of these plans be adopted, or whatever modifications may be introduced, the broad principle of taking the Christian races from under the yoke of the Ottoman Turks must indispensably be adhered to. The Porte is lavishly profuse in promises during the hour of need, but experience has too often and too sadly proved the utter illusion of ever expecting their fulfilment. To anticipate that it will ever utilize the Christian element, or ever give it fair play, or ever "ameliorate the condition of the Christians" in the European sense of that word, is a chimera and a dream. Such objects can only be obtained by placing the Christians in such a position that they may be free from the overbearing dictation and corrupting influences of Turkish authorities on

the one hand, and from the constant necessity of European intervention and protection on the other.

With good institutions and a defined basis for social improvement, the latter fruitful source of irritation and jealousy to the Porte, and which so far from being attended with any lasting practical benefit, has been the main source of all the recent calamities to the Christians, might altogether cease. Then the Ottoman Empire might with some truth boast of its independence, whilst its integrity would be strictly preserved. In a word, let the European Powers now interfere, once for all, on behalf of the Christians of Syria, resolutely, unitedly, and effectively, and then leave them to themselves.

The third plan emanates from Constantinople, and needs only to be noticed for its wild absurdity. Syria is to be divided into two Pashalicks instead of four. Each of the two new Pashas to be advised by a Municipal Council, in which a few Christians shall sit as members; in other words, a Municipal Council composed of fanatical Mohammedans and Christian mutes, forced to remain helpless spectators of every species of wrong and injustice to their co-religionists. With four Pashas, some chance existed of one perhaps being not quite so bad as his colleagues. With two, even this chance would be reduced to its minimum. The sword of Damocles would hang over the Christians by a slenderer thread than ever!

I am, &c.,
C. H. CHURCHILL.

April, 1860.

A writer in the *British Quarterly Review* on the massacres in Syria, well acquainted with his subject, observes:—

"With the facts we have referred to, before him, no man will be at a loss to discover the true source of Syria's miseries, and real origin and cause of the recent massacres. Islâm is at the root of the whole. Its spirit, foul and fierce, animates alike its stranger rulers and the great body of its native population. It

will permit no change, it will tolerate no reform. It will exercise unlimited, irresponsible control over the properties and lives of all subject to its sway, or it will exterminate them. It will use all agencies, it will take advantage of all circumstances, and will employ all means to effect its purposes. It allows no feelings of gratitude, honour, or humanity to restrain or set aside its designs. It is the determined and deadly enemy of civil and religious liberty. So long, therefore, as Islâm is paramount in Syria, the case of the country is hopeless, because reform is impossible. Islâm has hitherto opposed every theory of reform forced upon the attention and acceptance of the Turkish Government; and it has effectually prevented the reduction of any accepted theory into practice. The language used by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe in a recent speech in the House of Lords, is striking and most important: 'It is true the Sultan has accepted, and has even proclaimed to his people, a system of reform, which, if it had been properly carried out, might have prevented these disasters, and probably would have done so, and placed the empire on a totally different footing from what it is now on. Indeed, I must say with confidence, that had this been so, the empire would have been in a much better condition than at the present moment,—a condition of which the disasters which have occurred in Syria exhibit so prominent and striking an example. It must occur to your Lordships, as well as to myself, that a heavy responsibility rests upon the Porte, in consequence of this state of things. If we look into the question of Syria, it is impossible not to observe, in immediate connection with it, that the great Eastern question is involved; and I don't hesitate to say that that question is at this moment absolutely brought home to our doors by what has occurred in Syria. You will in vain put down what has taken place there; in vain you will staunch the blood which has flowed; in vain you will take measures to prevent the renewal of those atrocities, unless you find the means of engaging the Turkish Government to redeem their pledges, and give effectual execution to those reforms which have been

so often urged upon them. Unless that is done, it is my firm conviction that you will only patch up the difficulty for the moment; and you will leave the seeds of fresh disturbances and fresh difficulties of a still more disastrous and dangerous character.

There was one brief period in modern times, during which Syria visibly revived, and appeared to give fair promise of future prosperity. That was during the rule of Mohammed Ali. His rule was stern, in many cases severe, and in some instances perhaps cruel; but it was effectual. In the eight short years of his power, notwithstanding all the opposition he encountered from Turkey, he reduced the various warlike tribes to almost complete subjection, and to a great extent disarmed them. He rendered life and property everywhere secure. He gave a blow to Muslem fanaticism, from the effects of which it never revived until within the last few months. He compelled several of the wandering tribes of the desert to settle down into peaceful cultivators of the soil, and he made them all tremble at his name. He opened a wide door for the influx of European industry, commerce, and civilisation. Mohammed Ali was nominally a Moslem; but his whole policy tended gradually to set aside the spirit and principles of Islâm from the civil government of the country.

Taking all these facts and circumstances into consideration, we believe that Syria requires, for its permanent pacification and future prosperity, a separate government, somewhat similar to that of Egypt. Should it be found impossible to obtain the Porte's consent to an independent government, its ruler might acknowledge the suzerainty of the Sultan, and pay a fixed tribute; yet he ought to possess independent administrative power, and an army of his own. His independence, in this sense, ought to be guaranteed by the European powers; and a mixed commission might be appointed to aid in the devising and carrying out of needed reforms. The resources of the country are amply sufficient to maintain such a government; they only require development. Both soil and climate are well

missionaries meet with most opposition, at the hands of the Maronites. The Christians of this sect, who are called Maronites, will not be converted by the Christians of the other sect, who are called Protestants. Ergo, the former are in bad odour with the latter. But the heathen sect of the Druses have been at deadly enmity with the Maronites for the last twenty years, and for thirty-four years at variance with them to my knowledge (since 1827); therefore the Druses are patronized, petted, favoured, and commended by the missionaries, to the same extent that the Maronite Christians are reprobated, disliked, disparaged, run down, and written down, with all the zeal of exasperated theology by them.

Our consuls in Syria unfortunately, instead of minding their business, which I take it, is in relation to all matters that affect the material and political interests of their country, its commerce and affairs of state, think their first duty is to espouse the quarrels of the English missionaries with the Maronite Christians; and accordingly they pester their government with polemical views of English political interests in Syria; and everything that is Catholic in the constitution of the Maronite religion and sect, is a dangerous French element in their opinion, one that is naturally adverse to everything truly Protestant and British.

Ever and anon, this almost incredible view of consular duties on the part of the minor diplomatic agents of a great commercial nation brings us to the verge of a war, calls for the intervention of our ambassador at the Porte, overwhelms the home government with official correspondence about the contentions of sects and races in the Levant, pesters the Foreign Office with consular squabbles about rival missionary establishments in Syria, and sees nothing in their polemics but great interests of state, a question of the maintenance of English influence in the Turkish dominions, involved in those miserable disputes. Throughout all the districts of the Lebanon the danger of the ascendancy of French influence is thus made to appear imminent and formidable. Caligula is treated with too much

severity by historians for making a consul of his horse, he might have done worse—conferred the consular dignity on asses.

The ponderous official tome I have referred to, laid before Parliament in April 1860, informs us, that in virtue of a treaty between the five great powers, a French Army of about 6,000 men was despatched to Syria for the protection of the Christians of that country, in July, 1860. We are likewise informed that an inter-national commission consisting of five members (a representative of each of the great European powers) was appointed to proceed to Syria, with a view to the adoption in concert with the commissioner of the Porte, Fuad Pasha, of permanent measures of pacification, the adoption of the most prompt means of obtaining the satisfaction due to humanity for the outrages committed on humanity. We find in the instructions of Lord John Russell to Lord Dufferin, the most explicit directions to his Lordship. It would be his duty, he was told, "to inquire in concert with the other Commissioners into the origin and causes of the late deplorable events, to determine the share of responsibility incurred by the Chiefs of the insurrections and the agents of the administration, and to call for the punishment of the guilty." And Lord John Russell goes on to say there can be no doubt "the inquiry which he (Lord Dufferin) will conduct in concert with the Turkish Commissioner will have for its result the execution of severe and impartial justice with regard to the Chiefs as well as the subordinate instruments of crime." Nothing can be plainer than those instructions.

Have they been carried into effect? I am sorry to say they have not. Lord Dufferin's mission has been a failure. With the best disposition and most sincere desire to do his duty, he has failed to carry out one of the important instructions given by Lord John Russell with respect to the execution of severe and impartial justice on the "Chiefs of the insurrection" as the Druse murderers of the Maronite Christians are termed by Lord John Russell. In justice to that

adapted for the production of silk, cotton, olive-oil, and wine, in addition to an abundant supply of grain. The population contain in themselves the elements of industrial and political greatness. The Western Powers have now a fair opportunity of making a noble experiment; and it is to be hoped that mutual jealousies and fears will not be permitted to interfere. There are surely enough of inducements to this work, altogether apart from the gratification of petty national vanity, or the gaining of mere territorial aggrandizement. There is the preservation of the most interesting country in the world from utter ruin, the salvation of half a million of human beings from massacre or exile, and the relieving of Europe from the almost certain prospect of a general war. Prompted by a pure desire to accomplish such great and good objects, let our own country faithfully discharge her Eastern mission."

These are words of true wisdom—worthy of being spoken by a true Englishman, mindful of the eternal interests of truth and justice, and faithful to them, heedless of the fallacies and sophisms of statesmen and politicians, of their scribes and supporters in clubs and cliques of all sects and factions.

CHAPTER XIII.

Observations on the latest official correspondence relating to disturbances in Syria. Withdrawal of French troops and labours of International Commission.

THE last Blue Book—"Relating to the affairs of Syria," was presented to Parliament in April, 1861. The printed matter extends to 517 pages of a portly folio volume. I have elsewhere had occasion to observe that a vast volume of a blue book was a grand illustration of the art of ingeniously suffocating a troublesome subject, in a mass of words sufficient to overlay all facts of importance in it. The volume I refer to is a fine specimen of that ingenious art.

To disengage the facts that are of importance in the volume from the mass of consular twaddle and diplomatic verbiage, from all the sophistry, glaring inconsistency, prejudice, misapprehension and mis-representation that surround them, is a work of no small labour. I have made very copious extracts from this volume, it now only remains for me concisely and distinctly to set before my readers the important truths we arrive at, after a very careful examination and a painstaking study of this volume.

The British consuls of Syria believe that the imperial interests of England are bound up with the missionary interests of the several Bible Societies, whose agents are established in Syria. They imbibe the polemics of the missionaries, and they adapt their politics to them. Of all the Syrian races, the English

Lord Dufferin unfortunately delivered up his judgment to the Consular and Missionary influences of which I have spoken. He allowed his mind to be warped by them. He became exceedingly prejudiced against the great body of the Christian population of Syria—of the Maronites, he formed the most erroneous views of their character and qualities, their religion, and their priests and prelates. He vilified, and I am sorry to say he misrepresented—unintentionally, I am bound to believe—the Maronite bishops, in a most extraordinary dispatch of his to Lord John Russell, dated March 23, 1861 (see Blue Book, published in April, 1861, page 513), where he charges them most unjustly with seeking at the hands of Fuad Pacha the extermination of a large number of the Druse population of no less than 4310 Druses of the Lebanon. Let us see what those prelates have to say to this egregious imputation on their character and their religion.

Letter from the Catholic Bishops of the Lebanon to the International Commission in Syria, in reply to certain accusations brought against them in the British parliament:—

BEYROUT, MARCH 15.—It was with affliction and grief that we read in the *Independence Belge*, of the 11th of February, the article of which a copy is hereto annexed. If this article, based on declarations made in the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, in the sitting of the 8th of February, concerned only ourselves, we should not have taken the trouble of refuting it; but it concerns the Christian populations, whom it is attempted to represent as unworthy of the sympathies which their calamities have procured them on the part of the Sultan's government and of the great European Powers who have so generously hastened to their relief. It is, therefore, a bounden duty for us to re-establish the facts, and we are encouraged by so doing by the conviction that we shall not appeal in vain to the reminiscences of his Excellency Fuad Pasha, to the good faith of Lord Dufferin, whose thought must have been imperfectly interpreted, and to the sentiments of justice of the representatives of the European Powers.

When his Excellency Fuad Pasha was about to undertake the repression of the Druses he called around him six Christian bishops and requested them to name such of the more notable Christians, conscientious men and well acquainted with passing events, as might be able to give him information respecting the guilty parties. The bishops replied that the functions with which they were invested forbade them taking any part in a question which belonged exclusively to the judicial authorities. Fuad Pasha admitted the justice of that observation, and explained that he did not wish them to act in a judicial capacity, but simply to give him the names of persons on whose information he could depend. The bishops then gave the names of 16 most respectable Christians, all laymen, who were charged by his Excellency to supply the information he wanted, and who all engaged on oath to say nothing but the truth. Some days after these notables handed to his Excellency a list containing the names of 4,600 Druses, Mussulmans, and Metualis, living in the Lebanon, the Anti-Lebanon, and the Hauran, and chosen from among 30,000 combatants, and not from among only 8,000 Druses, as it is pretended, at the same time indicating the nature of the crimes imputed to each of the persons included in the list.

His Excellency again summoned the bishops to his presence to inform them that he well knew all the Druses to be guilty, but that the number given was too great, and that it was necessary to select only the most guilty. The bishops replied that they had no knowledge either of the list or the persons mentioned in it, and that, owing to their character, it did not become them to take any part in the affair. But the 16 Christian notables, when again consulted by Fuad Pasha, replied that the list they had drawn up by his orders was only intended as information to enlighten justice, and that neither they nor the Christian population would think of demanding that the repression should affect so great a number of victims. However, at the demand of his Excellency, they then reduced the list to 1,200 of those most compromised, leaving the judicial

noble Lord, it must be stated that nothing can be stronger than the language he employed, or more peremptory than the instructions he issued, in reference to the atrocities committed by the Druses, and the necessity of punishing adequately the perpetrators of them.

How is it, then, that not one of those Druse chiefs has been made to pay the penalty of their crimes? How has it happened that of all of those Druse chiefs brought to trial by Fuad Pacha, of whose guilt the official documents furnished by the Tribunal by which they were tried to the five European Commissioners, and printed in the parliamentary papers relating to the Syrian massacres lately published, can leave no doubt, who were found guilty by that Tribunal and sentenced to death, not a single one has been executed?

The answer is very simple, because Lord Dufferin's active intervention with Fuad Pacha, his Lordship's strenuous and unceasing efforts in behalf of the condemned, prevented the Turkish Commissioner from carrying into effect the execution of the sentences that had been pronounced on the Druses. Then one of the chief objects for which this international commission had been appointed—namely, the satisfaction of justice has utterly failed.

The failure, indeed, lies at the door of the leading member of this commission, who, though animated, as I have said before, by the best intentions, and no less estimable for his private virtues than for his mild, amiable, and conciliatory disposition, was nevertheless unqualified for the post to which he was appointed, and the very arduous and stern duties he would be called on to perform.

Lord Dufferin's infirmity of purpose, incapacity for action on his own judgment, deficiency of mental power and decision of character to enable him to come to right conclusions, and to adhere to them inflexibly, rendered him incompetent to fulfil the duties of his office, or to bring to the discharge of them the necessary requirements of firmness, self-reliance, and

distrust of the counsels, views, ,and opinions of the local authorities, and of consular and missionary influences.

The result was singular inconsistency in the whole course of Lord Dufferin's career as a commissioner, at one time at Damascus inciting Fuad Pacha to prompt and severe measures against the Mussulmen inhabitants of Damascus, bitterly complaining of his tardy proceedings, and at another period inveighing against the summary proceedings adopted by him against the Druses, finding fault with the rules of evidence on which the Druses were convicted and solemnly protesting against the execution of them on such evidence, and especially urging his intervention on behalf of the chief culprit of the Druses—Said Bey Djemblat.

By the same tribunal thirty-two Druses implicated in the massacres not having been arrested, were judged, condemned, "par contumace," and sentenced to death, but no effective measures were taken by the Turkish authorities for their arrest and when a small body of the French troops was allowed by Fuad Pacha to accompany the Turkish soldiers to the Lebanon with a view to the arrest of the guilty parties, Lord Dufferin remonstrated with Fuad Pacha against French soldiers being allowed to take any part in his military proceedings.

The views of our Consuls in Syria, adopted by our Minister at the Porte, have created for us a conventional diplomatic opinion of "The Eastern Question," which we receive with an implicit faith in its truth and justice. If ever there was a time when the ground on which it rested should have been closely examined, it was when the recent massacres of the Maronite Christians at the hands of the Druses and the Turks took place in Syria, and certainly upwards of eight thousand human beings, professing the Christian faith, were put to the sword, seventy five thousand persons put to flight, and of these twenty five thousand wretched fugitives, the wives and orphans of murdered Christians, were thrown on the wide world without house or home, food or raiment.

scheme of government for Syria (quite inadequate for the objects contemplated, and impracticable as I believe) which was rejected by the Porte. The Porte propounded a plan of its own, remarkable only for the audacity of its effrontery, in the face of Europe, attempting, as it does, to impose on the credulity of Christendom—a plan entirely nugatory, incapable of affording the slightest protection to its Christian subjects in Syria, and evidently and obviously not intended to accomplish any such object. That plan has been modified and accepted. Such is the state of things in the East; all our conventions are virtually of no effect, nothing permanently good has been accomplished, and everything that led to disturbance has been left unsettled by the commission, that is come or coming to an end, and the temporary occupation of a corner of Syria by French troops, where it has been sedulously kept in a state of inactivity, and from which we have insisted on its withdrawal on the 1st of June, 1861.

Our efforts on two occasions on behalf of the Turks have been crowned with such entire success, that we were enabled to deliver over to the tender mercies of the Turks, at one period, the Druses who had been, up to the period of Ibraham Pacha's invasion of Syria, virtually independent of the Turks; and, at another time, likewise the Maronites, whose independence had existed for centuries previous to the occupation of the Egyptians.

Mohammed Ali, on pretence of avenging wrongs done him by Abdullah Pacha, the governor of St. Jean D'Acre, sent an army into Syria under his son, Ibraham Pacha, of from 40 to 50,000 men, in 1832. From Acre to Damascus the country, in a short time, was in the hands of the Egyptians. A Turkish army was routed, and a little later another army of 20,000 men defeated, near Aleppo, a third Turkish army, under Nusem Pacha, of 36,000 men in the course of a few months, was still more signally beaten. At the beginning of August, 1832, all Syria was in the possession of Ibraham Pacha and his Egyptian army. At the end of December, same year, another

Turkish army of 60,000 men, under the Grand Vizier, was likewise worsted by Ibraham Pacha. In February, 1833, the panic-stricken Sultan had recourse to his great enemy, the Emperor of Russia, for protection against the Egyptians, who now threatened a descent on Constantinople, and a Russian army was kindly landed at Scutari to form a barrier against the further advance of the Egyptian forces. Efforts to obtain peace with the Egyptian Viceroy on the part of the Sultan were made, and after long negotiations the arrangement of Kutaieh was concluded, which, however, had not all the official formalities of an actual treaty, in virtue of which arrangement the whole of Syria was ceded to the Pacha, together with Adana. From 1833 to 1838 the arrangement entered into at Kutaieh continued in force. Syria was, in fact, an Egyptian province. In 1838 the Viceroy of Egypt took the first step towards his violation of the agreement by declining in future to pay any tribute to the Porte, and thus virtually asserting his independence. In the early part of 1839 the Sultan managed to raise and equip a large army to reduce his rebellious Viceroy, and accordingly assembled his forces on the eastern side of the Euphrates with the view of attacking opportunely Ibraham Pacha's Syrian forces. France and England interfered at this juncture to keep the Turkish and Egyptian armies from coming to an engagement, lest Russian interference should again be required. The Viceroy of Egypt gave an assurance to the consuls general of France and England to the effect that if the hereditary government of his territories was secured to him and to his descendants, he would withdraw a portion of his troops and conclude a formal and definitive arrangement with the Sultan.

No account was taken by the Porte of the proposals of the Viceroy. A manifesto was promulgated at Constantinople, by which the Viceroy of Egypt, and his son Ibraham Pacha were deprived of all the dignities and offices.

The famous battle of Nezib was fought on the 24th of June, 1839, in which the Sultan's forces were completely routed, and

authorities to ascertain their guilt, and the government to fix the extent and number of the punishments.

The bishops have, therefore, had nothing to do with the repression alluded to, and the notables only undertook to supply his Excellency with the information he needed for his guidance. As for the document mentioned in the House of Commons, the undersigned bishops declare that they never signed any such paper, and that it would be utterly impossible to produce anything of the kind.

Such are the facts. In recalling them to the memory of the Commission, the undersigned bishops venture to request its members, in the name of the Christians against whom this strange calumny has been raised, in order to deprive them of the sympathy of civilized nations, to communicate this declaration to their respective governments, and to publish it, so that the interest of which the Syrians are the object may not be diminished by the thought that they have shown themselves unworthy of it.

TOBIAS AOUN, Bishop of Beyrout.
BOUTHROS BOSTANY, Bishop of St. Jean d'Acre.
BASIL CHAHIAT, Bishop of Zahleh and Belka.
MATATHIOS, Bishop of Baalbeck and dependencies.

The Maronite Bishop of Beirout Tobias, on whom Lord Dufferin is particularly severe in several very inconsiderate assaults on the Maronite community in his despatches, is a virtuous, pious, and a peaceably-disposed Christian prelate, of whom Lord Dufferin in point of charity, benignty, and fair dealing towards his fellow men of all religious persuasions, in his condescension, might stoop to learn much that would be useful to his lordship, and of no disservice to his mission.

When I say this, I admit, or rather I avow, that I am aware, when this Bishop of Beirout became acquainted with the fact of the existence of a Turkish conspiracy against the Christians of Syria had been organised in Constantinople, and that the Druses had given in their adhesion to the project, and were making open preparations for a projected massacre of the Ma-

ronites, he advised the leading people of his community to be prepared for the coming tempest of fanaticism, and in a condition to defend themselves, their homes and altars, wives and families. Had his advice been taken, 8,000 lives of his flock might have been spared, and twenty-five thousand fugitives saved from a fate not less disastrous.

Lord Dufferin has adopted, to the fullest extent, the Consular and Missionary prejudices against the Maronite community. In his despatches, on several occasions, he speaks of them as savage and sanguinary, a besotted, ignorant people, having scarcely anything but the name of Christian belonging to their community. Lord Dufferin is an Irish Protestant dilettanti traveller in the East; he visited Syria a short time previouly to the late massacres, and he saw the people of that country through the eyes of the obsequious consuls and urbane missionaries always attentive, civil, courteous, and serviceable in their several spheres of utility to a Lord. But Lord Dufferin knew nothing of the Maronites or their priests or prelates of his own knowledge. I think I know them well; I have lived amongst them and with them on terms of close intimacy, and I have no hesitation in saying they have been as much misrepresented by Lord Dufferin (if the despatches purporting to be written by him, and published in the last blue book relative to the Syrian disturbances, are true and faithful expressions of his opinions) as it is possible to conceive the powers of misrepresentation to go. The Maronites are a thrifty, industrious, honest, kindly disposed people, strongly attached to their religion, by no means fanatical, savage or sanguinary. That is my estimate of their character.

But the great object of all of the international commission was professed to have been to consider and devise the best means of securing for the Rayahs of Syria, a strong government capable of protecting them from future massacres and spoliation and aggression either at the hands of Turkish authorities or Druses. The commission is now virtually at an end. We have insisted on the withdrawal of French troops. Lord Dufferin proposed a

man of a firm will, capable of acts of great savagery when his enemies fell into his power, as the ill-fated Sheik Bechir's family had terrible experience of in their own persons. While the Emir Bechir governed the mountain, the little jealousies, one might say natural antipathies, that existed between the Christian Maronites and Pagan Druses were never suffered to break out into those fierce explosions of rancorous hostility which from the period of his downfall and removal at the departure from Syria of Ibrahim Pacha became frequent and of periodical recurrence.

In 1838, the Druses of the Hauran revolted against Ibrahim Pacha, who, with an army of 40,000 men, was unable to subdue a horde of insurgent Druses not exceeding 3,000, commanded by Chebli-el-Harian. Ibrahim, after having lost nearly fifteen thousand of his best troops, found it necessary to have recourse to new means of effecting the subjection of the insurgent Druses. He determined on opposing the Christian Maronites to the Druses, Montagnard, like the latter, and accustomed to the mode of warfare of mountaineers. Ibrahim entered into communication with the Emir Bechir, who promised secretly to obtain for him the support of the Maronites, and to exercise his influence over the Druses in favour of the Pacha, on condition of Ibrahim supplying the Maronite chief, the Emir Medjid, with armies and munitions of war. Ibrahim immediately caused 7,000 muskets to be distributed to the Maronites, in concert with the Emir Medjid, for the special purpose of the Christians combatting the insurgent Druses. This fact is well deserving of attention, particularly that of Lord Dufferin, who appears to have been in utter ignorance of it, when he stated in one of his dispatches to Lord John Russell, that the late massacres of the Christians on the part of the Druses, was only a phase of the active hostility that has been for ages a normal state of things, one of furious animosity suddenly and spontaneously, or accidentally kindled into warfare between these deadly enemies, equally savage, fanatical, and sanguinary, the Maronites and Druses.

Now, here, in 1838, we have the origin of those fierce conflicts

between the two races breaking out into open warfare or massacre on a large scale, in the successful efforts of the Mosiem Prince Ibrahim Pacha, to set the Maronites and the Druses by the ears, arming the Christians against the Pagans, both adversaries of the faith of Islam, and enemies of the Turkish dominion.

This occurred in July, 1838, and before the end of the month, the arming of the Maronites and the bringing of them into action against the Druses, enabled Ibrahim Pacha to bring the Druses into subjection, and to deprive them of their independence.

The Viceroy of Egypt, in recognition of the services of the Maronites to his son, sent them a present of 24,000 muskets, "for them, their children and the children of their children." And in further evidence of his gratitude, he promised for the future, that the two taxes imposed on Christian Rayahs—the *Meri* and the *Ferdi*—should not exceed the amount at which these imposts were fixed in the time of the Sultan, Mahmoud the 2nd.

But when the Maronites had served the purpose of Ibrahim Pacha, these promises of his father were broken. He levied contributions on them which far exceeded any ever imposed on them by the Turkish Government. And when they grumbled and resisted the levies made by his officials, he deprived them of the arms his father had given "for them and their children, and the children of their children." The Emir Bechir was made the instrument of this enormous oppression and rapacity of Ibrahim Pacha in all the districts of the Lebanon.

So the Maronites, in 1840, in their turn were disarmed, and like the Druses were deprived of their independence. And then a community of misfortunes re-united the two widely separated sects. The Druses and the Maronites now held assemblies of the Chiefs of each community, and discussed projects of resistance to their Egyptian oppressors, and the result was a new revolt in the Lebanon on the part of the combined sects. Then followed the bombardment of Beyrout, Sidon, Caipha, Tripoli,

all the Turkish stores and munitions of war, 104 pieces of cannon and 15,000 muskets were left in the hands of the victorious Egyptian general. The tidings of this great disaster never reached Sultan Mohammed the 2nd, he died on the 1st of July, 1839. In the middle of the same month the whole Ottoman fleet was traitorously delivered up to the Viceroy of Egypt.

Mohammed Ali was now in a position, he thought, to propose rather exorbitant terms to the new Sultan. He offered peace, but he demanded as the price of it that the hereditary sovereignty of Egypt, Syria, and Candia should be conferred on him. And on this condition he pledged himself to become the faithful subject and sure ally of the Sultan, and in all emergencies to defend him and his Empire. These proposals were on the point of being accepted, when England, France, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, the five great powers, stepped into the field of Mussulman contention, and undertook the settlement of the Eastern question. At the commencemcnt of 1840, before the settlement was agreed on that was to be fatal to the ambitious designs of Mohammed Ali, he had in Syria under his son Ibraham 70,000 regular troops and 50,000 irregular bands and Bedouin Arabs, and on board the fleet 36,000 men ready for either service on land or sea.

About the middle of 1840 the settlement of the eastern question by the five powers was arrived at, and "the Brunow Convention" embodying, it was signed in London. By this convention it was agreed the following ultimatum should be announced to Mohammed Ali. That the hereditary sovereignty of Egypt should be secured to his family, and the Pachalik of St. Jean D'Acre possessed by himself for life, and that if he refused to accept these terms in ten days, the Sultan would offer him Egypt only, and if he still persisted in refusing, the contracting powers would force him to agree to these terms. The terms were virtually refused under the form of repeated efforts to gain time, and vague avowals of pacific intentions. At length the port of Alexandria and the ports of Syria were

placed under strict blockade by the Allied fleets. Beirout and Sidon were taken by an armed force of the Allies in Sept., 1840, and on the 10th of Oct. an engagement took place between the allied forces and those of Egypt, in which the latter were wholly discomfited. St. Jean D'Acre soon after was taken by Admiral Stopford and Commodore Napier.

Early in January, 1841, Commodore Napier proposed definitive terms of peace to Mohammed Ali which were accepted by him—on condition of having the hereditary government of Egypt conferred upon him, he consented to restore the Sultan's fleet and to recall his son Ibrahim, and the Egyptian army from Syria.

Thus passed away the dream of Mohammed Ali's ambition —of his sovereignty in Syria and Palestine.

Our unaccountable and inconsistent policy led to the evacuation of Syria by the Egyptians. That government with all its systematic rapacity was (for a Mohammedan Government) a strong, tolerant, and generally speaking, an enlightened government. The recent massacres of the Christians by the Druses never could have been perpetrated while Syria was under an Egyptian Government.

The Maronites are indebted to that unfortunate policy for all their recent sufferings and terrible loss of life and property.

In 1840, when our successful efforts against Mohammed Ali led to the expulsion of his army from Syria to the ruin and expatriation of the Emir Bechir, the astute Prince of an india rubber conscience at once a Druse and a Christian, who united in his rule the Supreme Government of the Maronite and Druses. Up to the time of the Egyptian invasion in 1832, the Lebanon was in a state of *quasi* independence, exempt from the immediate jurisdiction of the Turkish authority of the adjacent Pachaliks. The Maronite and Druse inhabitants of the Lebanon were governed by a common ruler—the Emir Bechir—a Druse prince of great power and influence, who, about 1827 or 1828, secretly adopted the Roman Catholic religion. The Emir ruled his subjects with a strong hand; he was a bold, unscrupulous

and St. Jean D'Acre by the Allied Powers, the retreat of the Egyptian army from Syria, and the occupation of several places on the coast by English forces.

Of this state of things, and all the confusion it led to, the Druses took advantage in the month of September, 1841, and made a massacre, on a moderately small scale, of the Maronites of Deir-el-Kammar. This was the first fruits of our efforts in behalf of Turkish dominion in Syria—the result of the first establishment of Turkish jurisdiction in the Lebanon. From this time, to 1845, the Druses were continually in a state of preparation for war against the Christians of the Lebanon, or actually engaged in it.

With respect to the last massacre of Syrian Christians in 1860, various estimates of the number slain have been given. Of the numerous productions that have appeared in France since the commencement of 1860 on the subject of the Syrian massacres, the one I have above referred to, entitled "Les Evenemens de la Syrie," by the Comte Melchior de Vogue, is particularly worthy of attention for the accuracy of its information, and the evident desire that is manifested in it to state facts and not feelings and impressions. Before I saw this work, I was struck with the smallness of the estimate made by Mr. Graham, and followed by Mr. Consul-General Moore in the account given of the numbers massacred at Hasbeya and Rasheya, they estimate the number at 700. Mons. de Vogue, states, and I believe his statement is much nearer the truth than that of Messrs. Graham and Moore, that the numbers slain at both places were 2,500: at Hasbeya 1,200, and at Rasheya 1,300. This was a joint carnage at the hands of Turkish soldiers and Druses. The unfortunate Maronites were the victims of that perfidy which is such a peculiar characteristic of the Turkish race. They persuaded the Christians of both towns to surrender their arms, and when they were defenceless, they were butchered in cold blood.

The author of "Les Maronites en France," (Par. 1860. p. 16), says, "on the authority of a missionary of high character, there

were 3,000 men massacred at Deir-el-Kammar." Consul-General Moore and Mr. Graham, estimated the number slain there considerably less.

And on the same authority, he says, "The Druses declare that the number of Christians they massacred in the Lebanon amounted to 22,000. The Christians believe the number was only 15,000." I believe it did not exceed 10,000; of this number 8,000 were slain, and 2,000 died of their wounds. Of the 75,000 Christian fugitives from their homes, prior to or pending the outrages of the Druses, I find little difference in the various statements of the number of widows and orphans, which is estimated at 25,000.

Even under the new system of government adopted for the Lebanon, I do not believe there is any probability of permanent security for the Christian inhabitants, not even for a single year.

Most assuredly, till such time as the people of the Lebanon, of all sects and races, are rescued from their present state of subjection to Turkish rapacity, oppression, and misgovernment; till a new form of separate and independent government is given to them adequate to the wants, and sufficient for the interests of these communities, there is no guarantee for their protection.

Till this state of security for the Christians of the Lebanon shall have been obtained by our demands on Turkey, and bonâ fide intervention at the Porte for the attainment of that object, there is no security for the peace of Europe.

CHAPTER XIV.

Death of Sultan Abdul Medjid and Accession of his Brother Abdul Azis.—
Latest Financial Statistics of Turkey.

DISPATCHES from Constantinople, dated 22nd of June, 1861, announced the definitive appointment of Davoud Effendi as Governor of the Lebanon. He was on that day invested as Governor of the Lebanon, with the rank of Mudir, and full powers, and was to proceed immediately to his post.

The last and befitting act of benevolence of the amiable Sultan, Abdul Medjid, and latest public act of his life, was the appointment of a Governor of the Lebanon, invested with full powers to protect the Christians of that region, and to restrain the ferocity of their sanguinary opponents.

And the successor of that most humane, mild, and tolerant of Ottoman sovereigns, is the fanatic brother of his, named Abdul Azis, the identical Prince whom the Mussulman fanatics of Constantinople, a few months ago, claimed as their partisan and found the defender of the Turkish functionaries, who so lately had aided and abetted the conspiracy concocted in Constantinople, against the lives of the Christians in Syria and other provinces of the Turkish Empire, that was carried into effect so successfully in the Lebanon by the Druses and the Turkish troops at the disposal of the principal Pachas in those regions that were the theatres of the late atrocities.

The English papers of the 26th of June, in which only four

days previously, the appointment of the Governor of the Lebanon by Sultan Abdul Medjid, had been announced, contain accounts of the death of the latter, the son of the great reforming Sultan, Mahmoud the 2nd.

Valide-Sultana, the mother of the late Sultan, originally a Georgian Christian slave given to Sultan Mahmoud II., had only one child, Abdul Medjid. The Sultana was greatly loved by Mahmoud. She was remarkable for her amiability of disposition and benevolence of character, no less than for her personal advantages.

But though Abdul Medjid was the only son of his mother, he was the twenty-first son of Sultan Mahmoud.

Abdul Medjid, born the 23rd of April, 1823, thirty-first sovereign of the dynasty of Othman, succeeded his father, Mahmoud II., in his 17th year, on the 1st July, 1839.

The new Sultan was a frail youth, prematurely exhausted, of feeble health and enervated energies. He came to the throne when the State was involved in difficulties and dangers of a most formidable character. Mehemet Ali, the Viceroy of Egypt had revolted, and even menaced Constantinople and Turkey with invasion. The Emperor of Russia, Nicholas, had embarrassed the Porte with importunate proffers of protection. The Janissary Institution was defunct, but the old spirit of fanaticism was kept alive by the Ulemas and Dervishes, and the old fierce hatred of reforms in the State which smouldered during the latter years of Mahmoud, was ready to be kindled into a new flame of tumult and commotion, by the rabble and the partisans of the old order of things, who made use of the turbulence of the lower orders of the capital. These difficulties were pondered over in the Seraglio before the breath was yet out of the body of Sultan Mahmoud, by Khosrew Pacha, Halil, and Said Pacha, and the two Chamberlains, Izzet and Riza.

Khosrew Pacha, a veteran minister, inured to the struggles of oriental politics, where people often have to fight not only for power, but even for life, was a sort of Turkish Talleyrand—

lame, like the French diplomatist, false and versatile like him, and like him ready to serve all ideas and all parties. He had resolved a very difficult problem, that of sharing, during fifty years, in all the intrigues of the Divan, without leaving his head behind him. Halil was the son-in-law of the Sultan Mahmoud, and the adopted son of Khosrew; nevertheless, a jealousy existed between them, although for the time-being their projects worked together well enough.

The violent explosion that was expected to have taken place on the occasion of the funeral of the deceased Sultan was prevented by timely precautions; a few private executions took place, and the discontented were aware that Husein Pacha, the man who had executed the vengeance of Sultan Mahmoud on the Janissaries, at whose hands they perished only thirteen years previously, had been recently recalled from his Pachalik in a distant province, at the instance of Khosrew Pacha and of the Sultana Valide, the mother of Abdul Medjid on no foolish or futile errand.

When old Khosrew and Halil, the latter the brother-in-law of Abdul Medjid, announced to the boy the death of his father and his own accession to the throne, it is said he neither manifested grief for the loss of his father, nor satisfaction for his elevation. He remained cold, silent, and a little timid. Perhaps he was frightened at his coming greatness, and incapable of analysing his confused sensations. Without delay, however, he appointed his brother-in-law Halil to the command of the army, and invested Khosrew with the dignity of Grand Vizier, a title which had been abolished by Mahmoud.

A very formidable conspiracy had been organized by the students and teachers of the religious schools and the inmates of the convents of the Dervishes—a crisis appeared inevitable, nevertheless, no one moved. Old Khosrew was on the watch; and the conspirators knew well what he was capable of doing, and ordaining to be done. The terrible Husein, the former Aga of the Janissaries who had been gained over by Sultan Mahmoud in June, 1826, and became the minister and executor

of his vengeance against the Janissaries, it was known had been recalled from Vardin, and his presence at the juncture in question, within the walls of the capital, was considered ominous and significant. So Abdul Medjid was allowed to take possession of, and to occupy the throne of his deceased father without molestation.

I have spoken sufficiently at large of the efforts he made to carry out the reforming views of his father, and even to surpass them. All the natural inclinations of this young man were good—mild and gentle in his manners, and just and humane in his sentiments—he abhorred acts of violence and blood-shed. It was his calamity to be bred in a religion which makes mercy, toleration and humanity, qualities at variance with the interests of the State, and religion of Mussulmans.

His education in the Harem, and the effects of a feeble organization ill directed in early life, imparted effeminacy to his appearance, and to some extent to his character. He was a benevolent, well-intentioned, justly thinking man, and of sound judgment generally, in matters, at least, which did not involve questions of finance or of expenditure. His great fault was extravagance. He wasted the resources of the empire, and his favourites followed the example, while the public creditor was unsatisfied, and fresh debts and taxes increased the burthens of the people. During the famine in Ireland, he was one of the most liberal contributors to Irish relief. He proposed to send ten thousand pounds out of his own private purse, but the British Ambassador considered a much smaller amount would suffice.

On his accession to the throne, he had recourse to the British Minister at Constantinople for advice and guidance, and from the beginning of his reign, his policy of reform and toleration, the whole régime of government and administration of justice, were publicly declared to be in accordance with European views. The famous Tanzimat, that re-organized *on paper* all the Institutions of the State, was proclaimed, and the praises of the new Sultan filled the leading journals of Europe and especially of

England. But the Tanzimat had no exclusive principle in it. And, no matter however excellent the intentions of the young Sultan may have been, there was no possibility of carrying them into execution. The Tanzimat fell still-born from the womb of State.

The young Sultan's career was a troubled one. He was, during his reign, in bad odour with his subjects, involved in several wars, overwhelmed with embarrassments, and the burden of public debt. When he died, the foreign journals that, in his early career, had extolled the young reforming Sultan who followed the advice of some diplomatic Nestor at the Porte, and sought to Europeanize his Mohammedan Empire, had no eulogies for his memory, not even a good word for his attempts at reform. Even the great virtue of humanity, which was so conspicuous in his conduct throughout his whole career, in notices I have seen of his death, was treated as a defect in his character which unfitted him for his throne. One morning journal, noticing his death says :—

"Abdul Medjid reigned in the midst of trouble, and his was not the nature by which trouble could be successfully opposed. There was nothing of sternness or determination in his composition—he was mild, gentle, and effeminate. A successor of Mahmoud and Amurath was so tender-hearted that he could not endure the sight of blood, and shrank from passing a capital sentence, even for the crime of high treason. The better parts of his character were well illustrated in that refusal to surrender the Hungarian and Polish refugees to Austria and Russia, which elicited the admiration of every true lover of freedom. But his merits were at the best of a character to shine but feebly in the occupant of a throne. He may have had good intentions, but he was without power to carry them into execution ; he may have framed excellent laws, but he could not put them into force ; and it was, no doubt, this inherent weakness of character that tempted those aggressions on the part of Russia, that led to the eventful Crimean campaign, by which Turkey has been saved for a season. What

her fate will be under Abdul Azis, the brother and successor of Abdul Medjid, no one can predict."

Another journal, on the same subject, observes:—

"The death of the descendant of Sultan Othman and of Solyman the Great, cannot be regarded in any other light than as a considerable benefit to his subjects. Whether the Turks could ever revive any portion of their ancient energies, even if they had such rulers as their early Sultans, is a matter of extreme doubtfulness. At least, they could not be worse situated than they have been under the rule of Sultan Abdul Medjid, who ascended the throne a mild and amiable boy, and died an old man wasted by excess ere he had attained his fortieth year. Few Sultans had a better start than he who is just dead. His fiery old father, Mahmoud, had murdered all the Janissaries shortly before his death, and the Janissaries were the only rivals near the throne that Turkish Sultans ever needed to fear. Great hopes were entertained of him, and he commenced his reign by the promulgation of an Edict of Universal Toleration. Unfortunately, he had not sufficient imperial power to enforce its provisions in distant pachalics. Not the less did he alienate from implicit loyalty the old Mohammedan party, who learn from the Koran that to slay a Giaour is to inherit heaven. At the same time, his own professions of tolerance, coupled with the undoubted impossibility of enforcing them, invited those various protectorates by the Christian Powers which weaken the central government, maintained chronic French and Russian intrigue, caused one war, and left the possible germs of many more. To crown the calamities of Abdul Medjid's reign, he was nurtured, and spent all his days under the shadow of the accursed 'social evil' of Mohammedan countries; and the chief tidings that we have had from Constantinople, in recent years, have been the profusion and prodigality of his expenditure for his hundreds of wives, and the palaces and kiosks they inhabit. We fear that the inevitable fate of Turkey is typified and foreshadowed by the ignoble career of its late ruler."

The 14 children of the late Sultan Abdul Medjid Khan, six

sons and eight daughters are thus enumerated and designated in the celebrated "Annuaire Diplomatique et Statistique Pour l'Année, 1861.—Almanach De Gotha," page 84.

1. Sultan Méhemmed Mourad Effendi, born 21st September, 1840.
2. Sultana Fatimah, born 1st Nov., 1840. Married in 1854 to Halib Pacha, a son of Redschid Pacha, deceased in 1858, married secondly to Mehemet Noury Pacha.
3. Sultana Refige, born 6th Feb., 1842, married in 1857 to Ethem Pacha.
4. Abdul Hamed Effendi, born 22nd Sept. 1842.
5. Sultana Djemile, born 18th Aug. 1843, married in 1858 to Mahmoud Gelal-Eddin Pacha.
6. Mehemmed-Rechad Effendi, born 3rd Nov. 1844.
7. Sultana Munire, born 9th Dec., 1844, married in 1858 to Ilhami Pacha, son of the Abbas Pacha, Viceroy of Egypt.
8. Ahwed Kemaleddin Effendi, born 3rd Dec., 1847.
9. Sultana Behige, born 16th July 1848, married in 1859 to Husni Pacha.
10. Mehemed-Buhran-Uddin, Effendi, born 23rd May, 1849.
11. Nour-Edden Effendi, born 14th April, 1851.
12. Sultana Senihè, born 21st Nov., 1851.
13. Sultana Féhimé, born 26th Jan., 1855.
14. Sultana Chémimé, born 1st March 1855.

Abdul Azis, the 32nd Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, the brother of the recently deceased Sultan Abdul Medjid, was born the 9th of Feb., 1830, consequently on his accession to the throne 24th of June, 1861, was in his 32nd year: an elder sister of his, Adileh (married to Mehemet Ali Pacha) was born in 1823.

In all respects different from his brother, the late Sultan, Abdul Azis is of a dogged and violent disposition—of a determined character, fierce in his hatred of Christianity and of Christians—a rigid Mussulman. The Ulema took him in hand at an early age, and moulded him according to their notions. He performs all the rites and forms of Mohammedanism,

with scrupulous regard to the injunctions of the Koran, and, was trained up for the special purpose of stemming the reforming spirit which Redshid Pacha had introduced into the government.

What will spring out of the change is for the future to resolve—whether the outlying provinces of the empire will take advantage of the occasion and assert their independence, or wait for the development of the new reign which European States will force into a liberal policy as the condition of their protection. Everything in Turkey indicates decay and dissolution. Notwithstanding the declaration of Lord Palmerston, that she has more real life now than at any period during the last two centuries—that her commerce is expanding, and her finances, if rightly applied, more than ample to meet all her engagements—diplomatists and statesmen, who had better opportunities of forming a correct estimate of Turkey, incline to the opposite view."

The "Moniteur" of the 27th of June, 1861, published the following notice :—

"A telegram has been received here, from Constantinople, announcing that Abdul Aziz, on the occasion of his accession to the throne, published a manifesto, in which he declared that he will follow the present foreign policy of the Turkish government. He also announced his intention to introduce great reforms in the interior in favour of all his subjects without distinction of religion. He concludes by insisting on the necessity for economical and financial reforms. The same telegram states that a modification of the Ministry is probable. Riza Pasha, the Minister of War, will, it is said, be replaced."

"We are told the death of the Sultan produced scarcely any effect upon the Paris Bourse. The general opinion seemed to be that, so far as regards the imminence of what is called the Eastern question, the Sultan was a better man than his predecessor, and more likely to adjourn the crisis."

The organs of the stock-jobbers in all countries, view public events of great pith and moment in one light only, and that

is, in the light of their present bearing on the funds; and whenever they propound opinions, signally at variance with the existing aspect of affairs, it is found that they are making their wishes fathers to their thoughts, and are exceedingly apprehensive their wishes will not be realized.

The leading organ of English public opinion has fulminated a leading article on the death of the late Sultan, and the destiny of the Turkish Empire; wherein, under a thin veil of apparently unbounded confidence in the good results of centralization, reform, and civilization in Turkey; and above all in the Turkish policy of our government for the past twenty years, and the protection of Western diplomacy, the most profound conviction peeps through almost every passage, that the Turkish Empire is on its last legs; the Turkish people are sunk in languor and lethargy, and the Turkish religion, is a faith condemned to an inexorable fate, from which no human effort can save it.

Some of the following passages of an article of "The Times," of the 26th of June, 1861, are remarkable for the ability and inconsistency that are blended in them:—

"Sultan Abdul Medjid is no more."

"Short has been his life, and troubled his reign, and he sinks into his grave at the age of thirty-eight, leaving a wasted empire, a decaying people, and a doomed religion to his successor."

"Abdul Medjid has reigned twenty-two years, under the protection of Western diplomacy. The statesman who is now at the head of the British government, may be considered to have been his guardian from the day of his boyish accession till now that he has sunk, a prematurely old man, into the grave. He ascended the throne in 1839, on the death of his strong-minded and courageous father, Mahmoud II., the Henry VIII. of Turkey, the destroyer of the Janissaries, the humbler of the vassals and officials of the empire, the centralizer and reformer, the great author of what is called Turkish civilization. It requires much confidence to affirm that measures adopted

under the advice of great European statesmen, and by the help of learned and active men from all parts of Europe, should have no good results, and that Turkey, by relinquishing barbarism, has thrown away the vital element of its own constitution, and we certainly hold no such opinion. But this may be said, that the thin and superficial civilization with which Sultan Mahmoud incrusted the rough race over whom he ruled, did not add to their strength or their confidence in themselves, though for a quarter of a century it imposed on Europe. When Abdul Medjid succeeded, he found himself master of a State in which Mohammedans had begun to dress after the model of Christian Europe, in which coats, and boots, and furniture had begun to be modelled after the fashions of Paris, in which schools were founded to teach sciences which the language of the country had not words to express, and which at the same time was subject to every evil which can afflict a body politic."

"The policy of Lord Palmerston, which triumphed on the occasion of Mohammed Ali's attempt on Syria and the Asiatic provinces of the Turkish Empire, has for twenty years since been accepted as that which ought to govern the dealings of Europe with the Turkish Empire. It may be summed up in a few words. To defend the Sultan against Foreign Potentates, and to aid him in ruling his own Pashas, has been the endeavour of England during the whole reign of Abdul Medjid. The results have been most remarkable. A tranquillity and order, a centralization without example for completeness, and a ready and even ostentatious loyalty to the Porte, marks every Mohammedan Governor throughout the empire. While the Danubian provinces have become virtually independent, while Servia and Montenegro are defiant as usual, the Sultan's authority extends peaceably to the borders of the French possessions in Africa, and to the shores of the Persian Gulf. But, with all this seeming unity and strength, the Turkish Empire is now more decripit than when Abdul Medjid began to reign, for the Turks themselves have lost heart and energy. The shock of war braces the nerves of a race which, with real vi-

tality of constitution, is sunk in languor or lethargy; but it is too much for those who are approaching their allotted term of years. The Turks have not rallied after the war of 1854. It is plain that whatever destiny may be reserved for the people, the whole fabric of Mohammedan society must be changed before new energy can be infused into it. Abdul Medjid was a type of the race and of the system. He was eminently a civilized Turk, as his father, Mahmoud, had made the governing classes. He was kind, averse from severity even to a fault; he had manners which became his high station, and went through his interviews with foreign ambassadors very decorously and courteously. But activity and forethought, and proper care for the empire, were utterly wanting. It is of no use to enlarge upon the private life of this unhappy prince, who, establishing a harem at the age of fourteen or fifteen, had the look and bearing of an old man before attaining middle age. His extravagance, and the extravagance of his wives, knew no bounds. How they spent their money is almost inconceivable. It went, not by thousands, but by millions of pounds sterling. Ever new palaces, new diamonds, new pensions to favourites or schemers of all kinds swallowed up revenues which would be considered large even in England. He has brought Turkey almost to the ground. His numerous sons and daughters have been magnificently provided for at the expense of the exhausted empire. He is now gone, and another, the thirty-second of the family of Othman, succeeds. This is Aziz Effendi, his brother, and the only other surviving son of Mahmoud. Aziz is said very much to resemble his father in character and vigour of will, but to be not a reformer and free-thinker, but a strict Mahommedan, and a reactionary in politics. Whatever may be his views, it is certainly an advantage to Turkey to have a ruler with some vigour of character, for even a despot of the school of Mahmoud or Mehemet Ali is better than a feeble sluggard like the Prince who has just passed away."

The "feeble sluggard" as the late Sultan Abdul Medjid, is termed who was "a civilized Turk" however, and "of manners

which became his high station," a "kind" man and "even averse to severity to a fault," was eminently tolerant, more so perhaps than any Turkish Sultan who preceded him—totally the reverse of his vigorous successor, his brother, the "strict Mohammedan," as he is described in the 'Times,' the fierce fanatic who was mixed up with the recent conspiracy got up in Constantinople, that terminated in the massacres of the Christians in the Lebanon, finds no favor in the sight of the organs of public opinion in France and England. But the strict Mussulman who hates Christianity and Christians, Abdul Aziz has some peculiar claim to consideration. The writer of the article I have just quoted, proclaims his preference for the new Sultan, "we think it likely that the new Sultan will prove a man of more powerful mind than his brother." . . .

"Whatever may be his views it is certainly an advantage to Turkey to have a ruler *with some vigor of character, &c., rather than a feeble sluggard like the prince who has passed away.*"

The latest news from Constantinople, confirms the opinion just expressed of the Turkish Empire, having got a ruler of some vigor of character.

"It is thought that the new Sultan will make a daring attempt to rouse the long dormant energies of the Mussulman population by working on their fanaticism, and that the Christians will be the first to feel the effect of the change."

The energy of the character of the successor of improvident Abdul Medjid was first displayed after his accession to the throne in a warfare in the name of economy on all the establishments connected with the late Imperial household, or that of the families and immediate friends and relations of the late Sultan. His household and harem, immediately after his death, were broken up with greater haste than comported with the respect due to the deceased Sultan. The old ministers, supposed to be favourable to toleration, were got rid of, and one of them was replaced by a Pacha, whose name is associated with certain massacres of Christians committed at Jedda, in his temporary absence indeed, but probably not without his

presumed satisfaction at the result of his previous fanatic regime.

It is very evident the Nestor of Eastern diplomacy perfectly understands the new Sultan and the peculiar vigour of his character.

In the House of Lords, 28th of June, 1861, the policy of Turkey and recent change of rulers, was made the subject of discussion :—

"Lord Stratford de Redcliffe inquired if the government had any information as to the policy likely to be pursued by the new Sultan of Turkey. The danger of a policy of reaction at the present crisis would be very great. The late Sultan, though indolent, and stained with oriental vices, had continued the great reform begun by his father, and had acted throughout his reign in a spirit of liberality and toleration. The present Sultan was represented to be a more energetic and violent man, disposed towards a revolutionary policy, and he thought that the Christian powers might interpose with their advice. He himself, from personal experience, was conscious of the peril which a revolutionary policy would involve, and, therefore, wished to know if the government had received official intelligence of the accession of the new Sultan, and whether they had reason to expect from him a reactionary policy."

The Constantinople correspondent of a London paper, says :—

"The new Sovereign's activity and lively interest in the working of the different departments of the State appears to suffer no diminution as the novelty wears off. Every day a visit is paid to one or other of the public offices or institutions. A decided preference, however, is shown for the military and naval services, and the constant donations to the regiments which happen to be on duty at any place His Majesty visits, give rise to a doubt whether revenues which have hitherto been squandered on the women and attendants of the Palace may not, for the future, be consumed in the more dangerous, if more useful, taste of playing at soldiers.

"Among the new arrangements in the palace, was one relating to the dismissal of the Kislar Agha, or chief of the eunuchs, a functionary of Sultan Abdul Medjid, with a salary of 30,000 piastres a month, which created great consternation in the Seraglio."

The following curious correspondence is published in a Trieste newspaper of September, 1861 :—

"Sultan Abdul Aziz promised to follow, and even to go beyond his brother, in the path of reform. Strangely enough, however, all the acts of his government maintain a medium position between progress and conservatism, and are often so ambiguous that neither party know what to rely upon. True it is that the ultra old Turkish party believe that they have the Padischah with them, and rejoice over every new decree that seems directed against progress or against the foreigner. Everybody applauded the Sultan when he showed a disposition to abolish the ruinous harem system by no longer keeping so many wives; but an order lately given is in the strongest contrast with the previous dispositions. Abdul Aziz has sent a deputation of the Circassian slave-dealers here resident to their native country, to bring him thence 150 young and beautiful girls for his harem. Meanwhile, many payments are seven and ten months in arrear, and foreigners especially are great sufferers under the new Sultan's strange system of reforms. In Stamboul, the other day an interesting public auction took place, which deserves notice as an illustration of how things are managed under the new regime. Illinski, the brave Polish general, who is perhaps better known as Iskander Pasha, died a poor man, and left to his widow and children, besides a little household furniture, nothing but considerable debts and claims on the military chest. Instead of behaving with due consideration to the widow of an intrepid officer, who had grown gray and been repeatedly wounded in the Turkish service—instead of at once handing to her the Pacha's arrears of pay—the Minister of War caused Iskander's scanty chattels to be put up to public

auction, in order, as it was alleged, to pay his debts. After numerous memorials to the new Ministers and the Sultan, it is said a small pension will be given to the widow."

The efforts of the new Sultan to diminish the expenditure, in whatever motives they originated, were meritorious; but the ultimate advantages expected from them, and the State-regenerating results from them which have been such frequent themes of praise and gratulation in the columns of French and English journals, will never be realized.

A glance at the Finances of Turkey will plainly show this to be the case.

LATEST FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

In August, 1861, a remarkable official document, printed by order of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—a statement of the Finances of the Turkish Empire at the present time, drawn up by the British Ambassador at Constantinople, Sir Henry Bulwer, with great care and ability. This statement, for its accuracy as to amounts, may be considered more reliable than accounts of travellers and other casual inquirers into this subject, which have been referred to in the preceding volume. The following extract from Sir Henry Bulwer's statement is therefore laid before my readers. It is necessary, however, they should bear in mind that the main object of this report of our Ambassador, is to show that the Finances of Turkey are in a prosperous condition, that her public debt is small in proportion to her revenues, and that her resources (which remain to be developed) are of a nature calculated to inspire confidence in her condition, and to raise her credit in the money markets of England and France. All the arguments used to support that view, the author believes to be mere sophistry. Turkey is not solvent. Her principal revenues, mortgaged to foreign capitalists, are

not applicable to ordinary governmental expenditure. The State could not live without yearly loans from foreign capitalists. The empire, in fact, is dependant on them.

Let not the reader therefore, when he examines the several items of the Revenue, allow himself to be imposed on by the supposition that all these amounts are applicable to ordinary state expenditure charges for carrying on the government, incurred and defrayed in the country. He will find the indirect taxes mortgaged to an enormous amount, to English and French capitalists, as the author has shewn elsewhere.

The following are the statements above referred to of Sir Henry Bulwer:—

REVENUE.

	£
Direct taxes	3,067,146
Indirect taxes	7,500,604
Produce of State property and public establishments	305,779
Fixed receipts	427,631
Miscellaneous	142,741
Total	11,443,901

And on the other side of the account:—

EXPENDITURE.

	£
Interest on debt	2,049,153
Expenses connected with religion	459,189
Civil list	1,393,123
Pensions	282,078
General services	9,222,501
	13,406,044
Deduct:—	
Measures of economy which have been ORDERED—	
Civil list £391,722	
Reductions in general services 1,269,120	
	1,660,842
Total expenditure	11,745,202

And the general result is:—

	£
Expenditure	11,745,202
Revenue	11,443,901
Deficit	301,301

Sir Henry Bulwer estimates that under proper management the revenue might be increased a third, and the expenses lessened a third.

If both these reforms could be effected, the balance sheet would stand:—

	£
Revenue	15,258,534
Expenditure	7,830,135
Surplus	7,428,399

Credit is taken by Sir H. Bulwer, for hypothetical economies:—

	£
In the civil list. . .	391,722
In the general services .	1,269,120
	1,660,842

"The Economist" cannot fail to see through the fallaciousness of a diplomatic financial statement—such as the preceding one. The anticipation of the Revenue stares him in the face. He cannot but think £1,660,842 out of a revenue of £11,433,901, is a large amount to save in a single year and demanding great administrative skill, great ability, and indomitable will, to save it in practice as well as on paper. But this patent uncertainty in the published statement is not the worst. As usual, the more critical difficulties are latent. The revenues above calculated have been forestalled, and the mode in which this has happened indicates a system of financial administration which will effectually preclude all financial prosperity, what-

ever may be the resources of the country, so long as it continues.

The revenues are in the hands of the State creditors. Money has been urgently required for the public service, and, as it could not otherwise be obtained, the public income has been mortgaged. Every year the same difficulty has recurred, and every year the mortgage has grown greater. A great deal of ready money,—"equal," Sir Henry Bulwer says, "to several millions, if not a year's revenue,"—must be obtained before the regular revenues of the country can be in the hands of the Government; and, unfortunately, ready money is the very thing which the Turkish Government never has—the very thing from want of which they have fallen into the present difficulties.

The following is Sir Henry Bulwer's "official account" of the public debt of Turkey:—

	£	£
Domestic debt		18,312,000
Foreign debt:—		
Loan of 1854, at 6 per cent. . .	3,000,000	
Loan of 1855, guaranteed by France and England, at 4 per cent . .	5,000,000	
Loan of 1858, at 6 per cent . .	5,000,000	
Loan of 1860, in France, through M. Mirès, at 6 per cent . .	2,037,220	
	15,037,220	
Less sinking fund, about . .	500,000	14,537,220
		32,849,220

The total amount annually paid for interest on the above debt, foreign and domestic, is £2,049,048.

Sir Henry Bulwer has given the several items of this charge in the detailed return of the expenditure, but it did not suit the argument of his Financial Statement to give the sum total of them, or to point attention to the enormous amount of this

charge for interest on the debt, say £2,049,048, in comparison with the moderate amount of the revenue, say £11,443,901.

General Budget of Income and Expenditure of the Turkish Empire for the year 1860.

INCOME.

	£	
Direct taxes :—		
Verghi, a rude sort of Income Tax	2,522,315	
Military redemption impost	544,831	
		3,067,146
Taxes	3,248,136	
Tax on sheep	756,120	
Tax on pigs	95,535	
Customs	1,611,587	
Customs on tobacco, including the right of sale	257,999	
Tax on fishing	78,759	
Produce of contracts	21,488	
Produce of stamps	28,457	
Tax on spirits	339,921	
Japan (imitation China)	131,844	
Sundry taxes	930,758	
		7,500,604
Public establishments :—		
Post Office	57,285	
Imperial Printing Office	8,372	
Property belonging to the State	31,611	
		97,268
Produce of Domains and Legal Rights :—		
Fisheries	18,302	
Forests	6,018	
Imperial farms	71,390	
Salt-pits	97,725	
Mines	10,451	
Sales of landed property	4,625	
		208,511
Tributes :—		
Fixed receipts	427,631	
		427,631
		11,301,160

	£	£
Add:—Special revenues of the Minister of Marine . . .	135,636	
Special revenues of the Minister of Commerce	7,105	
		142,741
Total receipts		11,443,901

EXPENDITURE.

	£
Foreign Debt:—	
Interest and redemption of debts contracted in Europe	842,986
Internal Debt:—	
Esham Djedidié, interest and redemption. .	182,800
Interest of the Sehims, of the Hasneh Tahvili, and with the bonds ten years to run . .	428,098
Interest and annuities of the Eshams, Moucatais, Timar, &c.	447,283
Interest of a loan from the Orphan's Bank, and of the war debts transferred . . .	147,981
Religious grant to the province of Hedgas, &c.: Yeman Surre (Group) Envoys to Mecca, &c.	459,189
Civil List:—	
Civil list and other allowances to relatives .	1,393,123
Pensions, &c.:—	
Pensions and aid to retired and necessitous functionaries	163,674
Ministers without portfolio, Tanzimat and Council of Justice	118,404
General Services:—	
Minister of War	4,491,272
Ordnance Department	293,243
Minister of Marine	898,051
Minister of Justice	97,391
Expenses connected with a certain kind of property called Vacoufs	173,494
Minister of the Interior	1,637,412
Minister of Foreign Affairs	148,200
Minister of Commerce	66,034
Minister of Public Instruction . . .	22,970
Minister of Police	127,186

Minister of Finance		£968,662
Charge omitted in the Budget of the Minister of Finance, but which should have been inserted by him		298,576
		13,406,044
Deduct :—		
Relinquished by the Civil List. .	391,722	
Deductions notified to the Council, &c.	1,269,120	
		1,660,842
There would remain of ordinary expenditure .		11,745,202

The natural state of the Turkish Government is one of insolvency, a perpetual state of want of ready money. Whenever a loan is negociated for, this condition of permanent embarrassment is so urgent that advantage is taken of its distress, and exhorbitant terms are proposed and accepted for any advances made.

This was the case when arrangements for a loan were entered into in the present year (1861), with a French stock jobber of notoriety. The Porte in treating for this loan, was quite content to pay an immense douceur called "commission" to M. Mirès for a small portion of the loan to be paid in hand.

Sir Henry Bulwer, however desirous he may be to bolster up the sick man's sinking credit, is not ignorant of the anomalous and dangerous position in which his Empire stands.

Sir H. Bulwer fully conscious of the evils that beset Turkish rule, describes them graphically :—

"The Ottoman Government (says Sir Henry), when it undertook to place the Empire on a new foundation, was neither entirely sincere in its professions, nor did it clearly understand what it was about. It accepted the announcement of great, immense, and sudden reforms, less with a desire to reinvigorate Turkey than to gain Europe. It was less occupied with the laws it was to make than with the newspaper articles it would produce. It consequently undertook too much, too suddenly,

and got confused amidst the novelties it promulgated. An uncertainty between the old and the new everywhere prevailed, and still prevails. A Pacha said to me the other day, "What am I to do? I govern a province, and the grand Vizier sends me an order which is framed on the new ideas that we profess. The Sheik-ul-Islam complains against me because I do not act upon the old laws, which with him are still sacred. I say the two things are incompatible; and I am told I must follow our own usages, but I must give them a new dress. I don't know what I am about."

"The object of late years has been to destroy personal responsibility of functionaries; and this project, as all functionaries have been interested in it, has succeeded. The Pacha can throw the blame of his acts on the Medjilis of his provinces. The minister of every department can say that his measures bear the signatures of all his colleagues. Add to this the endeavour to apply the complicated habits of European administration, and the refinement of European codes through the medium of people altogether ignorant of both; an accumulation of business in each department by the modern practice of immense and constant correspondence with no classification; and officials over whom there is no practical control."

Such is the state of things in all the govermental departments which exist in Constantinople and the administrations in the provinces, thus ably described by the British minister, Sir Henry Bulwer, a statistical writer of great eminence.

CHAPTER XV.

The Beginning of the End of the Turkish Empire.—Failure of its Institutions to fulfil the legitimate purposes of Governmental Regime, the well-being and protection of the people subject to it.—The Decay of Turkey, and impossibility of its Maintainance and Restoration.

A REMARKABLE article in the *Times*, in the past year, on the Syrian disturbances, commenced with these words:—"What are we to do with the Druses?" That question might be answered, More Hibernicé, by proposing another—"What are we to do with Turkey?"

This is really and truly the great question of the age. It is not a mere question of the extension of French influence or English; of Protestantism or Catholicism; it is one of the highest importance to the interests of humanity and civilization (rightly understood), far beyond the regions which are included in the Turkish Empire.

Nothing can be more clearly understood in Europe; nothing is more comprehensible to the intelligence of all people, even of those only tolerably well informed in every capital of Europe —that the Turkish Empire, utterly effete, decayed, rotten to its core, and devoid of mental energy, physically exhausted and destitute of all vigour and elements of vitality as it is, could not possibly subsist, if British diplomacy was not continually engaged in procuring for it a sort of Frankenstein monster existence, the violent and irregular movements of which it is unable to control, and if British capital, in the shape of loans, was not supplying the place of ordinary revenue to carry on the

government of this broken-down, bankrupt State, and thus enabling its fanaticism to live, and to animate and invigorate its barbarous institutions.

The Turkish Empire has now had its seat in the heart of Europe for four centuries—has had possession of several of its finest provinces and most fertile regions in Asia Minor, Messopotamia, Egypt, and Arabia Felix, of vast tracts of country, and territories of enormous extent in other parts of Asia and in Africa, formerly renowned for their productiveness and populousness, in some regions for periods varying from six to twelve centuries.

What has been everywhere the effect of Turkish rule and occupation? Ruin, desolation, industry trodden down, all energy and enterprise crushed, civilisation banished, Christianity proscribed, persecuted—the rich soil cursed by the evil influences of Mohammedanism, left uncultivated, depopulated, a wilderness of verdure, have been the result.

Every book of travel in the Turkish Empire—every work of any value, old or new, on the resources, regime, prospects, and condition of Turkey, tells the same heart-sickening tale of decay, of rapacity, and oppression, of brutalised force and terribly abused power, of government that answers not one of its legitimate aims and ends—the well-being and protection of the human beings who are subject to it.

Do Ministers of a civilized State, of a Christian nation, incur any moral responsibility, who labour incessantly, year after year, to sustain a power so inimical to civilization, so entirely incapacitated for progress or enlightenment, and incapable of fulfilling the duties of a State to its inhabitants?

Perhaps they are unconscious that any such responsibility is incurred by them. If they are so, most earnestly it is to be hoped and prayed for them, that they shall cease to be self-blinded and deceived as they seem to have been, before they appear at another tribunal, one more dread than that of public opinion or parliamentary privilege and authority.

The following passages illustrate the gradual decline of Tur-

key, from the period of her arrival at the summit of her greatness.

Two hundred and twenty years ago, Knolles said of this empire, "If you consider its beginning, progress, and uninterrupted success, there is nothing in the world more admirable and strange; of the greatness thereof, *nothing more dreadful or dangerous;* which wondering at nothing but the beauty of itself, and drunk with the pleasant wine of perpetual felicity, holdeth all the rest of the world in scorn."

Busbequius shortly after described the Turks as "trampling on the mangled bodies of hostile sovereigns and their subjects, reaching to the frontiers of Austria, and threatening Vienna itself."

Sandys, at the commencement of the seventeenth century, said, "It was to be hoped that their greatness was not only at its height, but near an extreme precipitation: the body being grown too monstrous for the head; the Sultans unwarlike, being corrupted with ease, wine, and women; their valour now meeting with opposition: the empire so got, when it beginneth to decline, doth begin to diminish."

Aaron Hill, one hundred and twenty years ago, thus describes the *Ottomans.* "Their European dominions are extended to the very borders of once lost Hungary, stretching to the Adriatic, by the Ragusian confines; bounded on the south by the Mediterranean Sea, on the east by the Pontus, Propontus, and Egean, even to the Scythian Chersonesus."

"But of late," he continued, "they are become modest; which may proceed from their numerous disappointments, that, in their modern wars, have so frequently baffled their presumtuous armies; and by curbing the designs of their ambitious Sultans, have taught them better how to know themselves, and prize their neighbours."

I know not in what history to seek a parallel for the sudden aggrandisement of the Turkish nation: as the last author has quaintly expressed it, "swallowing up at a morsel the conquests of Macedonian Alexander, and outdoing the stupendous

victories of the successful Jews!" And neither do I know in what history to seek a picture of national decline so striking as that of Turkey. A century and a half has sufficed to strip her of her glory, and to wring from her more than half her conquests. The pompous titles of her boundaries; the Pontus, the Propontis, the Egea, and the Adriatic, are now vain words; Circassia, the Crimea, Greece, Georgia, are gone; Bulgaria, Bosnia, are virtually lost.

MacFarlane, author of "Constantinople in 1828," published a work in 1850, entitled, "Turkey and its Destiny, the result of Journeys made in 1847 and 1848, to examine into the state of that Country." This work contains some valuable information with respect to the actual position of the Turkish Empire.

Our most eminent statesmen believe in the regeneration of Turkey—social, of course, as well as political.

But what will they say to the following observations of Mac Farlane?

"I would repeat again and again that this seclusion, or rather separation, of the wives (for the women are anything rather than secluded) is incompatible with any real advance of civilization, and that until this accursed harem system be abolished, of which there is at present not the slightest sign, there is not the shadow of a hope for that social regeneration, without which Turkey must perish amidst the scorn and contempt of the world. If you degrade the mother and the first teacher of the future man, the demoralization of the parent tells on the child. The first lessons are the strongest and the most enduring of all. The child receives his first education in the harem, be he the son of a Sultan or of the poorest of Turks; and what are the lessons he gets there from ignorant, indolent, and sensual women?"*

Mr. Urquhart, it is well known, is a firm believer in the regeneration of Turkey, and the power and excellence of the

* "Turkey and its Destiny," vol. 2, p. 257.

Turkish municipal institutions, which he designates the "Amphictyonic Councils," as essential existing elements of justice, law, and order, which may at any time be called from a somewhat drowsy and lethargic condition, into a state of activity, and be made great reforming agencies fully capable of regenerating the Turkish Empire. Mr. Urquhart sincerely believes in Turkey, and ardently loves its laws and institutions.

Mr. Mc Farlane has no faith in the Amphictyonic Councils; he has seen their working in Brusa, and described it fully in his work on Turkey, at page 41, vol. 2. He does not believe in the regeneration of Turkey. He denounces all the so-called reforms attempted in the reigns of Mahmoud the 2nd and his successor, as mere shams, flams, mockeries, and delusions.

In the Brusa Council or Shoorah, when Mc Farlane visited that important town, composed of thirteen members, nine were Mussulmans, and four were Rayahs—a heterodox Armenian (the Pacha's Banker), a Greek notable, a Jewish Rabbi, an orthodox Catholic Armenian notable. But two of the four Rayah members of the Council had already withdrawn, in disgust and despair of being able to check or control, in the smallest degree, the rapacity of the Pacha and his government. "In hardly any case," says Mc Farlane, "do they allow the Council a deliberative voice.

Skene, the British Consul at Aleppo, by far the most able and intelligent of all British functionaries in the Levant, in a report published in a Blue Book for 1860, of Consular communications on the trade statistics, &c., of the several countries they were employed in, in reference to a project (which meets with little encouragement at his hands) for connecting the Persian Gulph with the Mediterranean by a line of railway running along the valley of the Euphrates, makes the following observation:—"*Though the surrounding districts could thus be restored to their pristine fertility, such a change cannot be expected so long as Turkish misrule continues to weigh as an incubus on all enterprise, native as well as foreign.*"

Haleb, or Aleppo, says Mr. Consul Skene, at the beginning

of the 18th century, was supposed to contain 300,000 inhabitants. "But the natural effects of Turkish misrule and the increasing commerce by the Cape of Good Hope checked its growth." Repeated earthquakes, and especially that of 1822, which shook the town to its foundations, helped to complete its ruin. Mr. Skene estimates the present population of Aleppo at 100,000 souls, about 15,000 of whom are Christians.

In the middle of the last century, two hundred places where people had settled in the tract of country lying between Constantinople and Smyrna, including a region as fertile as any in the world, had become forsaken. In 1824, I travelled over that tract of country then waste and desolate, between Constantinople and Smyrna, a distance of 300 miles, and had ample opportunity of meditating on the results of Turkish rule—the inevitable tendency of it, the same now that it was when the Seljukian Tartars founded the Ottoman Empire, namely, to bring cultivation into decay, to crush and discourage industry —to make the land where Turkish rule had been established desolate.

Wherever Turkish rule exists, civilization must die out. The state of nature there, is a state of war with peaceful industry. Population and prosperity fade away. Rapacity and insolence cannot long abide except with poverty and wretchedness. Everything that has been constructed, is left to go to ruin and dilapidation. Everything that is done by Turkish authority tends to brutalize the character or to crush the spirit of man.

Go to whatever Turkish province you will, the peasantry are sure to be found poor, miserable, and oppressed, failing in number, deteriorating in condition.

The island of Candia, with which I am well acquainted, is one of the most fertile islands in the Mediterranean.

Its hundred cities are dwindled to a few wretched towns and villages. Its inhabitants are indigent, crushed by Turkish rapacity.

Cyprus of old celebrated for its fertility, its corn, wine

and metals—for the excellence of its soil and of its climate, is no longer "the paradise of the Levant," with its million of inhabitants. Its population is reduced to 30,000, cultivation is neglected, the people are oppressed, the country has ceased to be fertile, productive, populous, wholesome, and agreeable. The curse of Turkish rule upon it.

But humanity, outraged as it is in those dominions of the Turk, has its consolations. The Ottoman Moslems are dying out in Europe. Diarbekr with its population of 400,000; the middle of the last century in the course of forty years, had dwindled down to 50,000.

Bassora has fallen in its population from 100,000, to 8,000. Bagdad from 430,000 to 20,000. Mosul, in the memory of man, has lost half its inhabitants.

In Egypt, Turkish rule has had the same result as elsewhere, Egypt (says Mr. Alison), after all the revolutions which it had undergone, was rich and populous; but since the era of Turkish conquest, the repacious Turkish rule, the tyranny of the Pachas has expelled industry, riches, and the arts."

Another historian speaks in similar terms of Turkish rule:

"That fertile territory," says Robertson, "which sustained the Roman Empire, still lies in a great measure uncultivated; and that province. which Victor called *Speciositas totius terræ florentis*, is now the retreat of pirates and banditti."

"I have travelled," says Mr. Thornton, "through several provinces of European Turkey, and cannot convey an idea of the state of desolation, in which that beautiful country is left. For the space of seventy miles, between Kir Kalise and Carnabat, there is not an inhabitant, though the country is an earthly paradise. The extensive and pleasant village of Faki, with its houses deserted, its gardens overrun with weeds and grass, its lands waste and uncultivated, and now the resort of robbers, affects the traveller with the most painful sensations."

In the Morea, Chateaubriand, wherever he went, beheld villages destroyed by fire and sword, whole suburbs deserted, often fifteen leagues without a single habitation.

Dr. Newman in his lectures on Turkish history, states "the population of the whole Turkish Empire, is not a fifth of what it was in ancient times." Of two of its most fertile provinces, "not more than a fortieth part is under tillage."

A very able writer, profoundly acquainted with the Eastern question, in an article on the disturbances of Syria in the British Quarterly Review, makes the following observations on the Turkish Empire :—

"The Moslems have now for twelve centuries been the rulers of Syria: and at the present moment they constitute four-fifths of its whole population. Several distinct dynasties and races have during that period risen and fallen ; but the laws laid down by Mohammed, and embodied in the Koran, have been uniformly followed by them all. To understand Syria's mournful history, we must understand these laws. To discover the causes of the country's decay, of its progressive depopulation, and of the recent fearful massacres, we must study the principles of morality and legislation upon which the Mohammedan Government is based. The time has fully come for the politicians of Western Europe, and especially of England, to examine with care the genius of *Islâm.* The day has passed and gone for ever when Christian Europe trembled at that name, and the period has arrived when, by the exercise of an enlightened policy, one of the fairest portions of the world may be saved from its withering influence. The lessons learned from history are among the statesman's best instructors and safest guides. The history of the past twelve centuries, shows but too plainly the effects of Islâm on both individuals and nations—its moral effects, its physical effects, and its political effects. In the consideration of this subject, we must carefully distinguish between the *Mohammedan* Empire and the *Turkish* Empire. The former is the empire established by Mohammed, and which has ever received the Koran as its guide in all things, civil and religious. The latter is only one of its dynasties. The latter might still remain in power though it departed from the other. This act of separation might be effected at any time by the will of the sovereign

and his advisers; and we firmly believe that such a separation is absolutely necessary, not merely to the prosperity, but to the very existence of the empire. It will tend very materially to aid us in forming a true estimate of the genius of Mohammedanism, if we keep this fact in mind, that it has been adopted in succession by nations and tribes widely different in their origin, habits, and mental characteristics; and yet its effects upon all, have been invariably the same. It has run an uniform course among all the people that have embraced it, and the dynasties that have filled the throne of the Prophet. There has been in every case a rapid attainment of power by devastating wars, and then a progressive decline commencing from the moment when conquests were checked, and the "Faithful" sat down to reap the fruits of their victories. Islâm has always prospered in the camp and in the field; but when the excitement of war has passed, its life and vigour have disappeared, and its votaries have sunk into that state of moral degradation and physical debasement which are the necessary results of unrestrained licentiousness. Had Islâm survived only during a few centuries of the middle ages, it might have been supposed that to the state of those times was due much of the ruin and misery that were entailed on the countries over which it spread. But its working and effects are the same now in the nineteenth, as they were in the ninth century; they are the same under the dynasty of Othman and the supremacy of the Turks, as they were under the line of the Abassides and the rule of the Arabs. They are as little influenced by the civilisation and refinement of Western Europe, as they were by the luxury and superstitions of the Byzantine Empire. Islâm is incapable of advancement; and so long as it remains the sole source of a nation's laws, and the sole regulator of a nation's morals, that nation must continue morally and physically enervated. Such language may be distasteful to some in this country. A few good and great men have recently been in the habit of stating, that, after all, Mohammedanism has much that is good in it, and that it might even be regarded as

a kind of blessing, because it is better than some other conceivable forms of religion or superstition. To this we reply, Was it a blessing to destroy all the great old cities of Syria? Was it a blessing to depopulate the rich plains of Bashan, Hamath, Sharon, and Esdraelon? Was it a blessing to destroy, by wantonness or neglect, every road in the country, every harbour on the coast, every monument of taste, genius, and utility—to sweep away an extensive commerce and a prosperous agriculture? Was it a blessing to degrade and enslave a noble race of people? If these were blessings, then is Mohammedanism a blessing. No man, with Syria's dark history before him, can say that Mohammedanism is productive of aught but evil. We must look on that land, and its present faith, in a scriptural light, for thus only can we comprehend the philosophy of its sad history. A curse was pronounced on every province, and almost on every town, because of national sin. Mohammedanism has been, and is still, the instrument in God's hand for the execution of these curses.

"But some say Mohammedanism *is* changing; it is advancing with the spirit of the age; it is setting aside its old intolerant laws, and adopting the sentiments and policy of the liberal nations of Europe. This is all sophistry. Mohammedanism *cannot* change. Intolerance and mental and political slavery are inalienably linked to the system. The Turkish Government may abolish their new policy piecemeal. Every liberal principle they adopt must be at the sacrifice of a dogma of the Koran. The Turkish Government have manifested the greatest reluctance even to attempt this. Every concession hitherto made has not been granted; it has been wrung from them by strangers. Witness the repeated attempts made by England and France, to obtain a repeal of the inhuman statute which condemned every apostate from Islamism to death. For this so-called crime, a young man was beheaded in Constantinople in 1843. The whole of the Christian powers entered a strong protest against such an act of barbarity, and united in a demand for the abrogation of the law. Lord Aberdeen, in his despatch to the ambassador,

even went so far as to menace the integrity of the empire: "Your Excellency will therefore press upon the Turkish Government, that if the Porte has any regard for the friendship of England—if it has any hope that in the hour of peril or of adversity, that protection which has more than once saved it from destruction, will be extended to it again, it must renounce absolutely, and without equivocation, the barbarous practice which has called forth the remonstrance now addressed to it." . . . The Ottoman Minister of Foreign Affairs quailed at the threat of Lord Aberdeen; but his sentiments as a Moslem remained unchanged. After reading it, "he proceeded," writes Sir Stratford Canning, "to draw a strong line of distinction between custom and *divine law*, intimating that a practice derived from the former source might be abandoned to meet the wishes of Europe, or even of Great Britain alone; *but that a law prescribed by God Himself was not to be set aside by any human power*, and that the Sultan, in attempting it, might be exposed to a heavy, perhaps even to a dangerous responsibility." *(Despatch*, February 10th, 1844.)

The author of a remarkable volume—entitled, "Is it peace, Jehu," "By an Ex-Cabinet minister," published in 1860, makes the following observations on our policy with regard to the Turkish Empire, in the Preface to it:—

"The intelligence of the general atrocities in Syria, has produced much excitement in the public mind; and some of the most influential advocates of the "Integrity of the Turkish Empire," have begun to express doubts as to a policy, that involves such fearful consequences. It is to be hoped this may smooth the way, towards the new policy advocated in these pages; for assuredly, the retribution of Heaven will fall on this nation, if she longer persists in upholding, or tolerating the rule of, the Reviler of Christ; and subjecting those who at least acknowledge his Divine claims, however imperfectly they may comprehend Him, to plunder, pollution, slaughter, and gradual extermination.

"The fate of the Christians throughout the Turkish Empire

depends on Great Britain, since all that is needed for the overthrow of that degraded Mahometan State, is her consent. She is, therefore, responsible as a Christian nation, before God; who punishes for refusing to accept, or neglecting to perform, a work that He evidently appoints; as certainly as for doing, any thing that His commands forbid.

"By neglect of duty we have again afforded the Emperor of the French an opportunity of particularly distinguishing himself, by taking the initiative in a Syrian intervention. Are we committed to a long series of such errors? When will this proposed Syrian occupation end?"

The Count de Gurowski, in a work entitled "Russia and its People," 1854, thus speculates on the downfall of the Turkish Empire.

"The soil and region on which the whole Sclavic race is implanted, *between the Adriatic* to the mouth of the *Amoor or Shikas* emptying into the Pacific—This whole space is rich in all the climatic varieties of fertile productiveness on its surface, and with inexhaustible metallurgic wealth in its bowels. The statistics, whatever may be their fluctuations, give the number of the whole *Sclavic groups at about eighty millions*, of which Russia's genuine population makes about *fifty-seven* or *fifty-eight millions*. Add to it, on the Sclavic domain, the scattered Roumans, Letts, Arnauts, Moldavians, Armenians, Greeks, &c., numbering between eight and ten millions, tribes which never can assert or maintain a distinct and independent nationality, and who are bound to the Sclavi by the conformity of creed, and, to a great extent, by that of customs and manners of daily life, then the whole Sclavic element reaches more than ninety millions. By the natural increase of population of one and a half per cent. yearly, this mass will in a short time nearly approach the population of the remainder of Europe, which is almost over-populated; the Sclavic region being, on the contrary, able to support three.

"The empire of the Ottomans, at least in Europe, is rapidly approaching its end; no human aid can preserve it, and the

real question is, what banner shall, finally, be planted on the walls of Constantinople? It is Russia, and Russia alone, which, for more than a hundred years, has uninterruptedly drawn nearer and nearer, with a bold, aggressive, and steady pace. It is an old struggle, often renewed. It began nearly ten centuries ago, not between Turks and Russians, not between Christians and Moslems, but between Byzantium and its emperors and Kiïeff and its grand dukes.

"Generous, and, to a certain extent, seemingly well-deserved wishes, surround the fate of the Turks. But inexorable history marches onward, unfolding events from its womb, and unmindful of the clamours or sufferings of the day. There are some features in the character of the Turks commanding respect; but still they cannot avert the doom overtaking them. As Lamartine said, years ago, they are 'encamped in Europe.' They have put forth no roots during nearly five centuries of their occupation, but have continually formed an insurmountable barrier to the onward spirit and energy of Western Europe. It seems that all the branches and tribes of Scythic or Ouralian, Finnic, Hunnic, or Turkoman descent—all connected together—that these tribes were never predestined to grow and prosper on the European soil. Some of them even encircled by Christian civilization—as, for example, the Magyars—have remained for a thousand years without increasing in any way, by any idea or notion, the bulk of European culture. All of them appeared, or entered Europe on horseback, ravaging and pillaging, and producing hussars or spahis; and on horseback they successively disappear from the European arena.

"The Turks laid waste the most beautiful regions of the ancient world, where culture and civilisation flourished more or less from the dawn of history until overthrown by the Turkomans, as Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria, Greece, and Constantinople. The old, fierce, religious fanaticism of the Turks is dying out, and with it the only spring of their political existence is destroyed. No momentary reforms, sparingly spread over the surface, can inculcate a new life, not springing from within a nation. The

Moors, who were the benefactors of Spain, adorning her with arts, culture, refinement, poetry; who even, in many points, taught Europe; who spread larger and deeper roots in the Peninsula than the Turks in any soil occupied by them; the Moors, who resided in Spain nearly twice as long as the Turks this side of the Hellespont,—finally gave way and disappeared from the part of the globe not fated for the growth of the crescent.

"The Turks, as individuals, as a state, or a nation, seem unfit to become imbedded or intwined in the development of the principles admitted as fundamental in modern civilization, which cannot justly be named otherwise than Christian. Its true focus, its life-giving idea, is the substitution of humanity for the ancient heathen selfishness, looking with contempt from Saïs, Olympus, on all other members of the human family. The Koran inherited in full this ancient, hostile, isolating creed.

"The influence of the Christian idea seems to decide the question that the human race is to be for ever progressive. In the whole ancient world history points only to one people, to the Greeks, and even among them almost exclusively to Athens, where existed a spring of unborrowed progress within the people itself. The light now kindled can never more be extinguished, and each people belonging to the Christian world, contributes to nurse this sacred flame. All that is out of the Christian orbit remains fatal and stationary, deprived of spirit and elasticity. It opposes and counteracts all civilizing, cultivating activity, and as a barren fact, void of an inspiring idea, it is destined finally to perish. That is the destiny of the Koran, whose historical existence has been in unabated opposition to the Christian or European world. At present the Turks rather submit to, than admit, some modifications pressed on them by the current of events; but they never can undergo a thorough reform in the spirit of their cardinal institutions, without ceasing to be what they are now.

"When the moment for the expulsion of the Turks shall come, the utmost exertions will be required to prevent a cruel

and merciless retaliation, the long concentrated wrath increasing by the probably desperate resistance of the retiring foe.

"For Russia, for the present or any future Czar, the complication will really begin with the possession of Constantinople and its Turkish dependencies. The destinies of the nation, of Czarism, and of Europe, will then enter a new phasis. From whatever point of view we may consider this eventually, sure it is that the political past of Russia will approach its last stage with an accelerated velocity. For any one acquainted with the Russian history and character, it is clear that in the event of the Czar becoming master of Constantinople and of European Turkey, there will be nothing like an immediate erection of the conquered country into an independent state with a Russian prince at its head.

"The expulsion of the Turks, and the future possession of Constantinople, have been considered for years as the highest problem for European politics. On its solution depends not only the future political configuration of Russia, but her supremacy over the old hemisphere. Prophecies are at hand that the oscillating waves of the shock which is to ingulf the empire of the Ottomans will be deeply felt through the whole globe. Sinister and terrible consequences are associated with that eventuality. Without in the least contesting its grandeur, it may be contended, that what is now represented as ominous of evil, will, for reasons mentioned above, prove in the end a harmonious incident in the great drama of human affairs. It will become a galvanic spark, applied to the combustible and explosive elements, accumulated in Russia for centuries. Whatever may be the ambitious purpose of the Czars, and their hostility to the triumph of the principles of liberty and democracy, the enterprise set on foot against the world's welfare will turn against them."*

Other speculators on the downfall of Turkey and destiny of Constantinople, have made a very novel and ingenious disposal of the latter city.

* Count de Gurowski's Russia and its People, from page 300.

The author of the recent publication on the affairs of Syria, entitled, "Les Maronites et la France," Paris, 1860, puts forward a singular project for the pacification of Syria, and the settlement of affairs in Italy. He tells the Emperor the opportunity long looked for is come.

"Take, then, advantage of it, Sire.

"You are the natural intermediate between the people and the sovereigns; you who are Emperor by the grace of God and the will of the people.

"Be, then, the mover of a coalition between Russia, Austria, Prussia, England, and France, to drive the Turks from countries which they enslave.

"This vast heritage, which may fall, some day, into the hands of Russia, will be divided between the five nations.

"Constantinople, with an extended country around it, will form in itself a separate state.

"Could not the Pope accept it in exchange for Rome and the Roman States?

"Each of the five powers could place the portion, which will fall to their lot, under the authority of a prince of the reigning dynasty, which will be raised up again by the mother country.

"Europe will send to the East the surplus of its population, and those countries rendered productive by civilization, will be to them a pledge for future tranquillity.

"In the foregoing lines there is a proposition which, at first view, may appear paradoxical; it is the translation of the Pontifical chair to Constantinople.

"What a grand position would be that of the Pope at Constantinople, surrounded by the possessions of Christian princes in the centre of the universe! Each power would feel it an obligation for its own interest to maintain his independence and neutrality; and his port declared free, would become the depository of the commerce of the whole world."*

Dr. Newman, in his lectures on "The History of the Turks,"

* Les Maronites et la France. Paris, 1860.

1854, has the following concluding observation on the subject of the impending doom of the Turkish Empire:—

"A barbarian power has been for centuries seated in the very heart of the old world, which is in possession of most of the famous countries of classical and religious antiquity, and many of the most fruitful and beautiful countries of the earth, which stretches along the course of the Danube, the Euphrates, and the Nile; ranges past the Pindus, the Taurus, the Caucasus, Mount Sinai, the Libyan mountains, and the Atlas, as far as the Pillars of Hercules; and, having no history itself, is heir to the historical names of Constantinople and Nicæa, Nicomedia and Cæserea, Jerusalem and Damascus, Nineveh and Babylon, Mecca and Bagdad, Antioch and Alexandria, ignorantly holding in possession one-half of the history of the whole world. There it lies and will not die, and has not in itself the elements of death for it has the life of a stone, and, unless pounded and pulverized, is indestructible. Such is it in the simplicity of its national existence, while that mode of existence remains, while it remains faithful to its religion and its imperial line. Should its fidelity to either, fail, it would not merely degenerate or decay, it would simply cease to be.

In numbers the Turks are diminished and diminishing; their great cities are half emptied: their villages have disappeared; I believe that even of the fraction of Mohammedans to be found in their European population, but a miserable minority are Osmanlis. Too much stress, however, must not be laid on this circumstance. Though the Osmanlis are the conquering race, it requires to be shown that they have had ever much to do, as a race, with the executive of the empire. While there are some vigorous minds at the head of affairs, while there is a constant introduction of foreigners into posts of authority and power, while Kurd and Turcoman supply the cavalry, while Egypt and other Pachalics send their contingents, while the government can manage to combine, or to steer between, the fanaticism of its subjects and the claims of European diplomacy, there is a certain counterbalance to the

depravity and worthlessness, whatever it be, of those who have the nominal power.

A far more formidable difficulty, when we survey their external prospects, is that very peculiarity, which, internally considered, is so much in their favour—the simplicity of their internal unity, and the individuality of their political structure. The Turkish races, as being conquerors, of course are only a portion of the whole population of their empire; for four centuries they have remained distinct from Sclavonians, Greeks, Copts, Armenians, Kurds, Arabs, Jews, Druses, Maronites, Ansarians, Metoualis; and they never can coalesce with them. Like other empires, they have kept their sovereign position, by the insignificance, degeneracy, or mutual animosities of the several countries and religions which they rule, and by the ruthless tyranny of their government. Were they to relax that tyranny, were they to relinquish their ascendancy, were they to place the Greeks, for instance, on a civil equality with themselves, how in the nature of things could two incommunicable races co-exist beside each other in one political community? Yet if, on the other hand, they refuse this enfranchisement of their subjects, they will have to encounter the displeasure of united Christendom.

Nor is it a mere question of political practicability or expedience: will the Koran, in its laxest interpretation, admit of that toleration, on which the Frank kingdoms exist? yet what and where are they without the Koran?

Nor do we understand the full stress of the dilemma in which they are placed, until we have considered what is meant by the demands and the displeasure of the European community. Pledged by the very principle of their existence to barbarism, they have to cope with civilized governments all around them, ever advancing in the material and moral strength which civilization gives, and ever feeling more and more vividly that the Turks are simply in the way. They are in the way of the progress of the nineteenth century. They are in the way of the Russians, who wish to get into the Mediterranean; they are in

the way of the English, who wish to cross to the East; they are in the way of the French, who, from the Crusades to Napoleon, have felt a romantic interest in Syria; they are in the way of the Austrians, their hereditary foes. There they lie, unable to abandon their traditionary principles, without simply ceasing to be a state; unable to retain them, and retain the sympathy of Christendom;—Mohammedans, despots, slave merchants, polygamists, holding agriculture in contempt, Europe in abomination, their own wretched selves in admiration, cut off from the family of nations, existing by ignorance and fanaticism, and tolerated in existence by the mutual jealousies of Christian powers as well as their own subjects, and by the recurring excitement of military and political combinations, which cannot last for ever!

And, last of all, as if it were not enough to be unable to procure the countenance of any Christian power, except on specific conditions prejudicial to their existence, still further, as the alternative of their humbling themselves before the haughty nations of the West whom they abhor, they have to encounter the direct cupidity, hatred and overpowering pressure of the multitudinous North, with its fanaticism almost equal, and its numbers superior, to their own; a peril more awful in imagination, from the circumstance that its descent has been for so many centuries foretold and commenced, and of late years so widely acquiesced in as inevitable. Seven centuries and a half have passed, since, at the very beginning of the Crusades, a Greek writer, still extant, turns from the then menacing inroads of the Turks in the East, and the long centuries of their triumph which lay in prospect, to record a prophecy, old in his time, relating to the North, to the effect that in the last days the Russians should be masters of Constantinople. When it was uttered no one knows; but he tells us it was written on an equestrian statue, in his day one of the special monuments of the Imperial City, which had at some time been brought thither from Antioch. That statue, whether of Christian or pagan origin, it is not known, has a name in history, for it is one of

the works of art destroyed by the Latins in the taking of Constantinople; and the prediction engraven on it bears at least a remarkable evidence of the congruity in itself, if I may use the word, of that descent of the North upon Constantinople, which, though not as yet accomplished, generation after generation grows mere probable.

It is now a thousand years since this famous prophecy has been illustrated by the actual incursions of the Russian hordes. That was the date of their first expedition against Constantinople; their assaults continued through two centuries; and, in the course of that period, they seemed to be nearer the capture of the city than they have been at any time since. They descended the Dnieper in boats, coasted along the east of the Black Sea, and so came round by Trebizond to the Bosphorus, plundering the coast as they advanced. At one time their sovereign had got possession of Bulgaria, to the south of the Danube. Barbarians of other races flocked to his standard; he found himself surrounded by the luxuries of the East and West, and he marched down as far as Adrianople, and threatened to go further. Ultimately he was defeated; then followed the conversion of his people to Christianity, which for a period restrained their barbarous rapacity; after this, for two centuries, they were under the yoke and bondage of the Tartars; but the prophecy, or rather the omen, remains, and the whole world has learned to acquiesce in the probability of its fulfilment. The wonder rather is, that that fulfilment has been so long delayed. The Russians, whose wishes would inspire their hopes, are not solitary in their anticipations: the historian, from whom this sketch is borrowed of their past attempts,* writing at the end of the last century, records his own expectation of the event. "Perhaps," he says, "the present generation may yet behold the accomplishment of a prediction, of which the style is unambiguous and unquestionable." The Turks themselves have long been under the shadow

* Gibbon.

of its influence; even as early as the middle of the seventeenth century, when they were powerful, and Austria and Poland also, and Russia distant and comparatively feeble, a traveller tells us, that "of all the princes of Christendom, there was none whom the Turks so much feared, as the Czar of Muscovy." This apprehension has ever been on the increase; in favour of Russia they made the first formal renunciation of territory which had been consecrated in Islamism by the solemnities of religion, a circumstance which has sunk deep into their imaginations; there is an enigmatical inscription on the tomb of the Great Constantine, to the effect that "the yellow-haired race shall overthrow Ismael"; moreover, ever since their defeats by the Emperor Leopold, they have had a surmise that the true footing of their faith is in Asia; and so strong is the popular feeling on the subject, that in consequence, their favourite cemetery is at Scutari on the Asiatic coast.*

It seems likely then, at no very remote day, to fare ill with the old enemy of the Cross. However, we must not undervalue what is still the strength of his position. First, no well-authenticated tokens come to us of the decay of the Mohammedan faith. It is true, that in one or two cities, in Constantinople, perhaps, or in the marts of commerce, laxity of opinion, and general scepticism, may, to a certain extent, prevail, as also in the highest class of all, and in those who have most to do with Europeans; but I confess nothing has been brought home to me to show that this superstition is not still, a living, energetic principle in the Turkish population, sufficient to bind them together in one, and to lead to bold and persevering action. It must be recollected that a national and local faith, like the Mohammedan, is most closely connected with the sentiments of patriotism, family honour, loyalty towards the past, and party spirit; and this the more in the case of a religion which has no articles of faith at all, except those of the Divine Unity and the mission

* Thornton II. p. 89. Formby, p. 34. Eclectic Rev., Dec., 1828.

of Mohammed. To these must be added more general considerations; that they have ever prospered under their religion, that they are habituated to it, that it suits them, that it is their badge of a standing antagonism to nations they abhor, and that it places them, in their own imagination, in a spiritual position relatively to those nations, which they would simply forfeit if they abandoned it. It would require very clear proof of the fact indeed, to credit the report of a change of mind, which antecedently is so improbable.

And next it must be borne in mind, that, few as may be the Osmanlis, yet the raw material of the Turkish nation, represented principally by the Turcomans, extends over half Asia; and, if it is what it ever has been, might, under circumstances, be combined or concentrated into a formidable power. It extends at this day from Asia Minor, in a continuous tract, to the Lena, towards Kamtchatka, and from Siberia down to Khorasan, the Hindu Cush, and China. The Nogays on the north-east of the Danube, the inhabitants of the Crimea, the populations on each side of the Don and Wolga, the wandering Turcomans who are found from the West of Asia, along the Euxine, Caspian, and so through Persia into Bukharia, the Kirghies on the Jaxartes, are said to speak one tongue, and to have one faith.* Religion is a bond of union, and language is a medium of intercourse; and, what is still more, they are all Sunnites, and recognize in the Sultan the successor of Mohammed.

Without a head indeed, to give them a formal unity, they are only one in name. Nothing is less likely than a resuscitation of the effete family of Othman; still, supposing the Ottomans driven into Asia, and a Sultan to mount the throne, such as Amurath, Mohammed, or Selim, it is not easy to set bounds to the influence the Sovereign Pontiff of Islam might exert, and to the successes he might attain, in rallying round him the scattered members of a race, warlike, fanatical, one in

* Pritchard.

language, in habits, and in adversity. Nay, even supposing the Turkish Caliph, like the Saracenic one of old, still to slumber in his seraglio, he might appoint a vice-gerent, an Emir-ul-Omra, or mayor of the palace, such as Togrul Beg, to conquer with his authority in his stead.

But, supposing great men to be wanting to the Turkish race, and the despair, natural to barbarians, to rush upon them, and defeat, humiliation, and flight to be their lot; supposing the rivalries and dissensions of Pachas, in themselves arguing no disaffection to their sultan and caliph, should practically lead to the success of their too powerful foes, to the divulsion of their body politic, and the partition of their territory; should this be the distant event to which the present complications tend, then, the fiercer spirits, it may be supposed, would of their free will return into the desert, as a portion of the Kalmucks have done within the last hundred years. Those, however, who remained, would lead the easiest life under the protection of Russia. She already is the Sovereign ruler of many barbarian populations, and among them, Turks and Mohammedans; she lets them pursue their wandering habits without molestation, satisfied with such service on their part as the interests of the empire require. The Turcomans would have the same permission, and would hardly be sensible of the change of masters. It is a more perplexing question, however, how England or France, did they on the other hand become their masters, would be able to tolerate them in their reckless desolation of a rich country. Rather, such barbarians, unless they could be placed where they would answer some political purpose, would eventually share the fate of the aboriginal inhabitants of North America; they would, in the course of years, be surrounded, pressed upon, divided, decimated, driven into the desert by the force of civilization, and would once more roam in freedom in their old home in Persia or Khorasan, in the presence of their brethren, who have long succeeded them in its possession.

Many things are possible; one thing is inconceivable;—that they should, as a nation, accept of civilization; and in default

of it, that they should be able to stand their ground against the encroachments of Russia, the interested and contemptuous patronage of Europe, and the hatred of their subject populations."

A French Ecclesiastic, the Abbé de St Michon, in a work published in England in 1853, entitled—"A narrative of a journey in the East," concludes his labors with the following observations on Turkey and its destiny:

"Will the Turkish nation ever rise from its profound decay?

"A hundred times I have put this question to myself during my travels. And I always solved it in this way: the Turkish Empire, as at present constituted, cannot be maintained. This long extended body, the emaciated limbs of which stretch from the Bosphorus to the sands of Arabia, is at its last gasp. Its agony may be prolonged; but it can never rise again with vigorous life.

"All the intelligent men whom we met in our travels, Englishmen, Russians and others, carry from the East the same conviction. The Turkish people is now arrived at the last stage of being.

"The Turks are a people in their second childhood; they require to grow up again, and again arrive at maturity. But, in the meantime, they must sink under the burden of an empire too heavy for their feeble shoulders. The Turkish nation requires the peaceable possession of the countries in Asia Minor, where it is now dominant; but Armenia, Syria, Arabia, the islands of the Archipelago, and Turkey in Europe, should be declared independent, either with a native government, or under the protectorate of the great powers of Europe. It is in vain for diplomatists obstinately to persist in their efforts to maintain the seat of the Turks at Constantinople. They thus sacrifice even the true interests of this people."

The readers of this work—who have now considered the Turkish Empire in its relations with christianity and civilization must decide for themselves—for I venture to assert there are ample data in these volumes to enable them to come to a deci-

sion, on the question—*Is it for the good of the interests of the faith of Christians, for the interest of civilization, which are not only bound up with, but based on that faith, that the Turkish Empire and its Mohammedan institutions, should be maintained.*

Is it for the honour of the English nation, for the prestige of British philanthropy, for the character of British statesmen, for the morality of their high state policy, and the glory of the sovereign of these realms, that the Ottoman Empire with all its innate hatred of christianity, and indomitable spirit of fanaticism, and irreclaimable barbarity and savagery in governmental administration, should owe the continuation of its being to British statesmanship, and to British gold.

Some admirable sentences, worthy of being written in letters of gold, are to be found in an ably conducted weekly journal, on "interests, real and supposed."

We wish statesmen, who devote vast energies to purposes of temporary expediency, or of questionable morality, would turn their minds to the study of the history and "the inexorable logic of facts" therein recorded.

He would there discover—"that justice, and truth, and honor are the weightiest interests of the nations of the earth; and avarice, selfishness, and ambition dig the graves and weave the shrouds of peoples otherwise prosperous and strong. National existence ought not to be preferred to honour. National conscience is nobler than material wealth. Glory is lost when justice is violated, or goodness persecuted, or wrong inflicted. Athens sunk into a village, Carthage buried in the sands, Babylon represented by a few molten bricks, Egypt perpetuated in its gigantic pyramidal tombs, Venice with its palatial steps covered by the seaweeds—Naples, and Rome, and Vienna, all speak one 'inexorable fact,' that the vital element of national greatness is moral, not material; and that every attempt to reverse this great law has recoiled on the experimentalist in ruin and remorse. The mark of decadence is visible where many trumpets once sounded forth prophecies of immortality. Names that shook the world are forgotten.

Genoa was once a powerful and wealthy republic; it is now a memory, and little more. The free cities of Flanders are cities of the dead. The phalanx of the Macedonian, the legions of Rome, the guards of Napoleon, did nothing to perpetuate, and much to overturn the empires to which they belonged. The foundations of empires are composed of better and more lasting materials."

But this Turkish Empire exists, and the question it will be said is,—What is to be done with it?

Are we, by violent means, to bring it to an end?

To this I answer, our duty to Christianity and to civilization does not require us to do so. Such means are not legitimate, and, therefore, could not be adopted by people who believe in Christianity. All that is necessary for us to do, all that is legitimate for us to do, is to leave this Turkish Empire to itself; to let it fall by the weight of its own iniquities.

We have caused the deaths of upwards of a quarter of a million of human beings, from 1852 to 1856, in endeavouring to maintain this empire.

Our capitalists have supplied the far greater portion of thirty millions sterling, in loans, to have this government carried on. Let Turkey be left to fight her own battles, to find her own resources.

The ultimate disposal of her territories cannot be determined, regulated, or legitimated, by any ally of hers, however ancient, faithful, and natural he may be. The dismemberment even of the Turkish Empire, that might be most desired and promoted by certain European powers, solely with a view to their own sordid views of territorial aggrandisement, eventually in all probability would be more advantageous to the commercial interests, and therefore to the imperial interests of Great Britain, than it would be to them.

When we entered on the Russian war for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire, we were informed, on the highest authority, that we had embarked in it in behalf of the interests of civilization.

The interests of civilization there are identified with those of the Turkish Empire. And as our civilization is identified with Christianity, and Mohammedanism is the basis of all Turkish power, it follows that Christianity is interested in the protection and defence of Mohammedanism. When we speak of barbarism, we mean to speak of a state of ignorance of all laws, divine and human, and of subjugation of reason to passion, of an existence in which the appetites are indulged, prejudices are fostered, fiercely contended for, and no talents are improved, no social progress, no intellectual advancement is made. And when we speak of civilization, we must mean (if anything is meant by the term) a state of mental cultivation and moral discipline, in which a man is able to subordinate his appetites and natural impulses to reason, by the joint influence of education and religion. Civilization then tends to improvement, progress, refinement, and humanization, to energy of character, action, the development of an inner life, the exercise of all faculties given to us, and modes of thought that are calculated to exalt our nature, and to show that—" we are born to do benefits."

Civilization owes its origin and its progress to the elements of Christianity which surround it. Suppose religion was discarded and that science and art, skill and ability in physics, in politics, in œconomics, and mechanics, were only looked to for the maintenance, the advancement, and perfectability of civilization, what grievous disappointment would not be experienced. But what is called civilization in parliamentary phraseology and newspaper literature, is more generally ascribed to commerce and political economy than to religion. It is vain, however, we look to trade and political economy, and material developments only for tendency to civilization. The true elements of civilization are to be found in intellectual, moral, and religious principles, in the power of self-control, self-concentration, and the ability to appreciate duly the interests of truth, justice and humanity.

Are we prepared to encounter another Crimean war for Turkey and her abominable institutious?

I have elsewhere given at large official details of the expenditure we encountered, and the loss of life we sustained in the Crimean war.

In that war, undertaken and carried on, for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire, according to Mr. Milner Gibson's estimate, we expended, in round numbers, 100 millions sterling, and lost about 50,000 men.

But if we reduce those numbers—the former item for expenditure to 60 millions, and the latter for loss of life to the period of the return to England, of the survivors of the English army, to 30,000 men, we can find evidence for those estimates in official returns.

Is it for the interest, honor, or glory of Great Britain, to expend sixty or one hundred millions more of money, and thirty or fifty thousand lives for the maintenance of this Turkish Empire, in its constitution, its religion, in all its civil institutions—hostile to civilization and Christianity?

FINIS.

APPENDIX.

—o—

No. 1.

Sir Moses Montefiore the originator of the Relief Committee in aid of the Christian Sufferers of Syria, in the disturbances of 1860.

In 1829 my first work, an account of travels in the East, the result of four years' sojourn in Turkey, Syria, and Egypt, was published, and inscribed to Sir Moses Montefiore. In the interval between my earliest acquaintance in the East with Sir Moses in 1827, and the renewal of it in the same region in 1840, when I accompanied him on his mission of beneficence on behalf of the persecuted Jews of Damascus, the subject of Turkey and its institutions largely engaged my attention.

In 1840 the co-religionists of Sir Moses were persecuted by the Turks, instigated, I am sorry to say, by Christians of that city of Damascus, then, as it now is, the centre of all fanaticisms. A third and last visit of mine to the East, in the autumn of 1860, has shewn me very plainly that the fierce intolerance manifested in 1840 on the part of Christians, which brought Turkish brutality to bear on the Jews, has now directed its savagery, and that too of its most ferocious character, against the Christians of Damascus and the Lebanon.

I had occasion, in a work which I published in 1841, in relation to Egypt and Mohammed Ali, to speak of that unsectarian spirit of philanthropy which I have had so many opportunities

of seeing displayed by Sir Moses; and also to recall the generous impulses of one always prompt to act, and feel in unison with him when good was to be done, or suffering to be alleviated; one whose daily life and practical religion ever seemed to me to be an exemplification of the sense of duty comprehended in the words of our great dramatic moralist—

"We are born to do benefits."

These observations have been elicited, and the reminiscences of past years connected with them vividly recalled, by a document in relation to the recent Syrian massacres, and the part taken by Sir Moses on that occasion, which has been very lately brought to my knowledge. The document I speak of is very worthy of being noticed in this work, which treats so extensively of the Syrian massacres.

On the 10th of May, 1860, the first intimation of the cruel sufferings of upwards of 20,000 human beings in Syria, the survivors of the late massacres, was made in this country in the House of Lords.

On the following day that intimation came to the knowledge of Sir Moses Montefiore. Knowing well, as he did, the country where these horrible occurrences had taken place, and the condition of the people who had escaped the carnage, bereft of everything—home, friends, food, and clothing—he realized at once the whole amount of suffering that was caused, and the vast proportions of the calamity that needed to be fully comprehended, to be relieved. Deeply moved by these considerations, and greatly agitated by them—he was heard by one, to whom I have above referred—thinking aloud, and giving expression in exclamations rather than in distinct terms or observations, to the horror he felt, and the conviction forced upon him that something must be done in relation to the sufferings he had just read of, and that amiable person, whose good offices on all similar occasons I have referred to, said:—"Lose no time in taking some step to raise funds to relieve those poor Christians

of Syria." The step was instantly taken—the right step in the right time, and the right place. The following day, before any Christian project or proposal was announced to obtain funds and procure relief for the Syrian sufferers, the following communication was published in the *Times* newspaper:—

THE CIVIL WAR IN SYRIA.

(*To the Editor of The Times.*)

SIR,—I have noticed with the deepest sympathy the statement made last evening in the House of Lords, that owing to the recent out-break in Syria, there are 20,000 of the Christian inhabitants, women and children, wandering over its mountains exposed to the utmost peril. Being intimately acquainted with the nature of that country and the condition of its people, I appreciate, I am sorry to say, but too painfully the vast amount of misery that must have been endured, and which is still prevalent.

I believe that private benevolence may do something towards the alleviation of the distress of the unhappy multitude now defenceless, homeless, and destitute.

I well know from experience, the philanthropy of my fellowmen, and I venture to think that the public would gladly, and without delay contribute to the raising of a fund, to be applied as circumstances may require and under judicious management, for the relief of these unfortunate objects of persecution.

I would suggest, therefore, that a small, active, and influential committee be at once formed, with the view of raising subscriptions, and of placing themselves in communication with the British consular authorities throughout Syria, so that assistance may be rendered by the remittance of money and the transmission of necessary supplies, and I take the liberty of enclosing my check for £200 towards the proposed fund.

Your recent eloquent and judicious advocacy of the cause of

the Syrian Christians has encouraged me to address you, and will, I trust, be a sufficient excuse for my so doing.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
MOSES MONTEFIORE.

East Cliff Lodge, Ramsgate,
July, 11th, 1860.

The committee so timely suggested by Sir Moses was appointed, and the following extract from a letter of the chairman, to the Consul-General of Beyrout, will show in what a spirit of fairness, singleness, and earnestness of purpose the proceedings of that body were carried into effect:—

Extract of a letter from Sir C. E. Eardley to Mr. N. Moore, Consul General, Beyrout; dated 27th July, 1860.

"The Committee desire that relief may be afforded, without distinction of sect or party, to all parties suffering distress in consequence of the disturbances; and are instructed to express a wish that the money may be so administered as to prevent the possibility of its being thought that this Committee takes any part between the contending parties, or pronounces any opinion upon the origin of these unhappy events."

Thirty thousand pounds was soon collected by that committee, the great bulk of that sum has been distributed, and now at the close of its labors a balance of about fifteen hundred pounds remains; which some parties, happily few in number, erroneously consider should be applied to the promotion of purposes connected with the proselytizing labours of certain religious institutions in the East. But I would beg leave most respectfully to assure the members of that truly benevolent committee, my information leaves me in no doubt whatsoever as to the existence still of a vast amount of suffering in Syria that has not been relieved, and that stands in urgent need of charitable assistance.

No 2

The Number of Believers in Mohammedanism and Buddhism.

The number of believers in the Koran can only be estimated by conjecture. The most conflicting statements have been made on this subject. In Bossuet's time it was calculated by a very learned writer that the area of the countries which professed Mohammedanism exceeded by one-fifth those in which Christianity was believed. (See Brerewood's Inquiries touching diversity of languages and religions. Lond., 1674, p. 144). It is easier to judge of the extent of Mohammedan countries than of the extent of their population. In 1839 Sharon Turner estimated the Mohammedan population of the world at 80 millions. Dr. Eliotson in 1840 considered that population exceeded 122 millions; while according to Mr. Wilkin (see note to a passage in Sir Thomas Brown's works), there were 188,000,000 of Mohammedans distributed over the old world.

Buddhism owns far more followers than Mohammedanism, vast as the amount of believers is in the law of Islam. It would be well for the Christian proselytizing institutions of our country, whose labours are mainly directed to the conversion of Christians, not in all respects believing in the dogmas of the particular church or sect, the members of that institution belong to, to consider the vast field there is for their exertions in those immense regions of the globe, in which Buddhism and Mohammedanism prevail, and Christianity can scarcely be said to exist.

We are told by an eminent writer of well known accuracy in his statements, Sir James Emerson Tennent, in his work on Ceylon (vol. 1, p. 524), that Buddhism can boast of no less followers than 350 millions of the human race. "Looking (says Sir James) to its influence at the present day over at least three hundred and fifty millions of human beings, ex-

ceeding one-third of the human race, it is no exaggeration to say that the religion of Buddha is the most widely diffused that now exists, or that ever has existed since the creation of mankind."

To form any useful idea of the preceding estimates it would be desirable to have some corresponding data as to the population of the five great divisions of the nations of the globe.

A professor of eminence of the Berlin University has been recently making some remarkable researches respecting the population of the globe. The following is the result:—"Population of Europe, 372,000,000; of Asia, 720,000,000; of America, 200,000,000; of Africa, 89,000,000; of Australia, 2,000,000; total population of the globe, 1,283,000,000.

No. 3.

TURKISH SULTANS.

1.	Othman I. began to reign . .	1300
2.	Orchan	1326
3.	Amurath	1350
4.	Bajazet I.	1390
4.	Mahomet I.	1405
6.	Amurath II.	1422
7.	Mahomet II.	1450
8.	Bajazet II.	1481
9.	Selim I.	1512
10.	Soliman I., The Magnificent .	1520
11.	Selim II.	1566
12.	Amurath III.	1574
13.	Mahomet III.	1603
14.	Achmet I.	1610
15.	Mustapha I, (Deposed) . .	1617
16.	Othman II. (Mustapha restored for some months)	1621

17.	Amurath IV.	1623
18.	Ibrahim	1640
19.	Mahomet IV.	1649
20.	Soliman II.	1687
21.	Achmet II.	1691
22.	Mustapha II.	1695
23.	Achmet III.	1702
24.	Mahmoud I.	1730
25.	Othman III.	1754
26.	Mustapha III	1757
27.	Abdul Hamid	1774
28.	Selim III.	1789
29.	Mustapha IV.	1807
30.	Mahmoud II.	1808
31.	Abdul Medjid	1839
32.	Abdul Azis	1861

No. 4.

THE CRUSADES.

1st	Crusade	set on foot in	A. D. 1095.
2nd	ditto	ditto	1147.
3rd	ditto	ditto	1189.
4th	ditto	ditto	1197.
5th	ditto	ditto	1203.
6th	ditto	ditto	1216.
7th	ditto	ditto	1248.
8th	ditto	ditto	1270.
9th	ditto	ditto	1275.
10th	ditto	ditto	1394.

No. 5.

The Suez Canal Project.

In all probability M. Lesseps' project to unite the Mediterranean with the Red Sea by a canal would never have been heard of, if Colonel Chesney's project had not been likely, some years previously, to have been carried into execution, to open a communication with India, and had the colonel not fixed on the valley of the Orantes at the foot of the Lebanon to unite the Euphrates with the Mediterranean.

A few years ago it was also proposed in England to connect the Persian Gulph with the Mediterranean, by a line of railway running along the valley of the Euphrates. The scheme was perhaps likely to benefit England, by bringing her nearer to her Indian possessions, but in a mercantile point of view the advantages were extremely doubtful. The projectors calculated on this line engrossing a third of the present Indian maritime trade of the countries bordering on the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, yielding a revenue estimated at £830,000. The Persian trade, which at present takes the Trebezonde route, it was supposed would yield £400,000. The present traffic between Bassorah and Bagdad would yield a profit of £74,000, and the grain produce of Babylonia would be so augmented by the railway facility of carriage, *it was supposed*, as to produce a revenue of £662,000. The preceding items would be increased, it was calculated by £1,118,400 for the transport of 400,000 passengers per annum, thus making a total of £3,084,800 sterling. Such magnificent railway results in the gorgeous East are splendid objects *on paper*, and no prospectuses indeed can be more plausible.

A less splendid programme, but "a more sober scheme," is set forth in a report of Mr. Consul Skene to his government in 1858—namely, the construction of a macadamized road, that

would connect the Euphrates with the Mediterranean—a distance of 150 miles, a project that might be accomplished by local enterprise *assisted by British capital*, if such assistance were possible. The navigation of the Euphrates is encumbered with difficulties in the early part of its course, so as to be scarcely navigable for large boats till it reaches Nitt, 500 miles lower than the proposed line of junction. The Euphrates presents the anomaly of a great river running through most fertile countries, in which all the energies of the people are crushed: and very limited cultivation is carried on in consequence of the rapacious tyranny of Turkish rule, and the total want of any protection to industry afforded by it.

In Egypt the railway from Alexandria to Cairo had just been completed. Another railway, from Cairo to Suez (since completed), was then in embryo. A railway in European Turkey (since completed also), was then projected.

Opening of the first Turkish Railway.

The "Times" correspondent writes under date of Oct. 4, 1860, from Kustendjie:—

The opening of the first railway in Turkey was celebrated this day. In 1857, certain gentlemen obtained the concession by virtue of which the Danube and Black Sea Railway has been called into existence. Tchernavoda, or, as the Turks call it, Boghaskeui, on the Danube, and Kustendjie, on the coast of the Black Sea, are names probably unknown to the majority of your readers.

From Tchernavoda, where the Danube makes a great detour to the north in order to discharge its waters by the mouths which have formed the subject of so much discussion, to Kustenjie, on the coast some 90 miles northward of Varna, is a distance of about 40 miles. From Tchernavoda to Kustendjie by the Sulina mouth it is fully 300 miles. It follows, there-

fore, that a person coming down the Danube to Constantinople or the Levant would save something like 260 miles by availing himself of the railway. This is not the only advantage. The navigation of the Lower Danube is uncertain, and delays constantly occur owing to want of water on the bar. This consideration applies with tenfold force to the conveyance of grain. The captain of any vessel who has once received a cargo of grain in the Danube for conveyance to Western Europe, will bear testimony to the dangers and delays involved in the passage of the Sulina mouth. Could he but receive his cargo in a safe port in the Black Sea, he would be content to make a great reduction from the amount of his freight. Shipper and shipowner would alike benefit by the change. It was to effect this object that the Danube and Black Sea Railway was designed. Hitherto I have made mention of the railway alone. The construction of this would, however, not suffice. The port of lading must be safe, and the western shores of the Black Sea offer but few places of refuge from a storm. The bay at the northern entrance to which the village of Kustenjie is situate, affords no shelter from north-easterly, and but little from south-easterly gales. It was ascertained, however, that a mole of 600 yards in length, projected from the northern shore of the bay in the direction of the opposite headland, would form an efficient guarantee against every contingency.

A small portion only of this mole has up to this moment been constructed; but already there is a safe anchorage for several vessels.

Now that the railway is opened, the works of the port will be pushed on with additional vigour, and there seems every reason to believe that in a very short time vessels of a large size will be able to receive their cargoes, which will be shot into them directly from the railway carriages, in perfect security.

The construction of the line of railway presented one difficulty, which many pronounced serious, some insurmountable. In order to avoid a great deal of heavy and expensive cutting, it

was necessary to carry the line through a valley which extends from Tchernavoda for some twenty five miles in the direction of Kustendjie. This valley which averages a mile in breadth, was subject to inundation in the spring, when the waters of the Danube attain their highest level. During the greater part of the year the whole extent of country thus situate was little better than a mere morass.

The engineers of the company had, however, seen their way out of the difficulty. Notwithstanding the doubts expressed on every side they never wavered, and two years ago they threw up a dam on the bank of the Danube at Tchernavado, across the ravine through which the floods made their way into the valley.

Several directors of the company arrived here in the course of the week (of which company Sir S. Cunard is chairman). On their way out to this country the directors concluded arrangements with the Danube Steam Navigation company, the Austrian Lloyd Company, and the railway companies on the route, by virtue of which after the beginning of next year the voyage from Constantinople to London may be performed in six days, in lieu of nine, which is the time occupied in travelling by the present routes.

No contractor has been employed by the company. The resident engineers themselves have carried on every foot of the works, and have brought the line to the verge of completion for the sum of £250,000, which is all that has been hitherto expended in the works of the railway and port. The various English railway projects and proposed canal undertakings in the Turkish Empire, evidently called into existence the grand French project to connect the Red Sea with the Mediterranean.

If the projected Maritime Canal of the Isthmus of Suez should fail of being carried into effect, it will not be from any want of ability and energy on the part of M. F. de Lesseps in writing up the undertaking.

The first work on this subject, entitled "The Isthmus of Suez

Question," Par M. F. de Lesseps, Minister Plenipotentiary, was published in England in 1855.

The second English publication on this subject, edited by the same author, appeared in 1856, entitled "New Facts and Figures relative to the Suez Canal, with a Reply of M. B. de S. Hilaire to the Edinburgh Reviewers." The Editor is styled in this work also, Minister Plenipotentiary.

The third publication in relation to the project of the Suez Canal, is entitled "Percement de l'Isthme de Suez, Rapport et projet de la Commission Internationale, avec documents Publiès par M. F. de Lesseps." Paris, 1856. In this work the author has omitted in the title-page the qualification found in the two preceding works, of "Minister Plenipotentiary."

The fourth, and latest publication of M. de Lesseps, on the same subject, is an English version of "The Report of the International Commission, with Appendix containing latest Official Documents." London, 1857.

M. de Lesseps, in 1855, in his work entitled "The Isthmus of Suez Question, states that—"In October, 1854, he left Europe for Egypt in consequence of an invitation he had from the Viceroy, Said Pacha, who for twenty years had honoured him, M. de Lesseps, with his friendship. He accordingly proceeded to Egypt, but had no mission from his government. It was in the course of a journey from Alexandria to Cairo, the idea of cutting through the Isthmus of Suez was for the first time mooted between them. M. de Lesseps does not say by whom the project was first mooted. The Pacha called on him to draw up a memorial on the subject, which memorial, meeting with his approval, he issued a firman destined to receive the sanction of the Sultan, granting to a Company, to be composed of the capitalists of all Nations, the right to construct a canal between the two seas. M. de Lesseps, assisted by two eminent civil engineers in his service—Linant Bey and Mougel Bey—was dispatched to Suez on an exploring expedition, in Dec., 1854. The result of his renewed examinations, and those

of the civil engineers, was a report to the Vice Roy, setting forth the practicability of a maritime canal from Suez to Pelusium, thirty leagues long, one hundred metres wide, and eight metres deep* extending sufficiently far into the two seas by means of jetties to obtain the depth neccessary to enable ships to enter without difficulty, having an inland port in the natural basin of Lake Timsah, and which should be completed in six years, and would cost 160 millions of francs or £6,400,000 sterling.

[But in a subsequent work on the same subject, we find the International Commission, in its report, have raised the maximum to 200,000,000 of francs or £8,000,000 sterling.

M. de Lesseps says, when he announced his project in the principal money markets of Europe and in England especially, he reckoned confidently on support, and particularly at the hands of British commercial enterprise, and that he expected also encouragement and co-operation at the hands of British statesmen.

He could not believe it possible it would be discouraged by the British government for the following reasons:—

1st. England transacts more than half the general commerce with India and China; she has an immense empire in Asia; she may reduce by one third the charges in her commerce, and bring that Eastern empire nearer to her own island by one half. Therefore, England had more to gain by this project than all the other nations together.

2nd. The exports of England to the East will be enormously increased by the proposed maritime canal.

After a little time M. de Lesseps discovered that he had formed an erroneous opinion with respect to the expected

* Equivalents in English monies, weights, and measures of those of France referred to by M. de Lesseps.

1 Franc = about 9½d., or 25 francs = 1 pound sterling.
1 Quintal = about 220½ English lbs.
1 Metre = 39⅜ inches English, nearly.
1 Kilometre = about 1093¾ yards, or nearly 5 furlongs.
1 Hectare = nearly 2½ acres.
1 Litre= about 1¾ pints.

encouragement for his project at the hands of British statesmen. He was forced to believe that apprehensions were conscientiously entertained by them. 1st, that shortening the distance to India by three thousand leagues for all the countries of Northern Europe, and by 3,400 leagues on an average for the parts of the Mediterranean, might not in future, in case of war, menace the safety of the British possessions in India.

2nd. That the commercial and maritime relations of Great Britain might be disadvantageously affected by the opening of the new route, which, while shortening the distance for her own navigation, would, at the same time facilitate and increase the navigation of all other nations towards the extreme east; and, further, that as Venice lost her power by the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope, England might see hers decline by a return to the shortest route to India.

M. de Lesseps, however, affects to make light of these difficulties, and to rely on "public opinion, which is so powerful in England, dealing justly with interested opposition to this great project, and those superannuated objections" to it.

In a memorial to the Viceroy of Egypt, dated November, 1854, M. de Lesseps observes:—

"The junction of the Mediterranean and the Red Seas, by a navigable canal, is an undertaking the utility of which has attracted the attention of all the great men who have reigned in, or conquered Egypt: Sesostris, Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, the Arab Conqueror Amrou, Napoleon I., and Mehemet Ali.

"A canal communicating with the Nile was in existence in ancient times; first, for a period of 100 years, down to about the middle of the ninth century before the Hegira; secondly, for a period of 445 years, from the reign of the first successors of Alexander the Great, down to about the fourth century before the Hegira; thirdly and lastly, for a period of 130 years after the Arabian conquest.

"Napoleon, upon his arrival in Egypt, immediately organized a commission of engineers to ascertain whether it would

be possible to re-establish that ancient channel of navigation; the question was resolved in the affirmative, and when the learned M. Lepère delivered to him the report of the commission, on the eve of his return to France, he said:—'It is an important affair; it is not in my power to accomplish it, but the Turkish Government will perhaps one day owe its preservation and its glory to the execution of this project.'

"Lebeau in his 'Histoire du Bas Empire' (Vol. 12, p. 490), following the Arabian Historian and Geographer, who flourished in the 14th century, says:—'The coast at Farma (a town a little to the east of Pelusiam, on the Mediterranean), was only seventy miles (106,000 metres) distant from the Red Sea. This space was a very smooth plain, slightly elevated above the level of the two seas. Amron formed the design of uniting them by a canal, which he would have filled with the waters of the Nile; but Omar having opposed it from fear of opening an entrance into Arabia for the ships of the Christians, Amron turned his thoughts in another direction. There was an ancient canal called Trajanus Amnis, which Adrian caused to be brought from the Nile, near to Babylon in Egypt, as far as Pharboëtus, now Belbeis. He met at this place with another canal, commenced by Nechos, and continued by Darius Hystaspes, and the two together, discharged themselves into a lagoon of salt water, at the outlet of which Ptolemy Philadelphus caused a large trench to be made, which conducted the waters as far as the town of Arsinoë, or Cleopatris, at that part of the gulf where Suez now is.

"The whole of this canal, being filled up with sand, had become useless at the time of the famous Cleopatra. Amron was not deterred by the ancient prejudice, which, supposing the waters of the Red Sea to be higher than the soil of Egypt, created a fear of opening a passage for them, and he made it navigable for the transport of the corn of Egypt into Arabia. It is that which is now called Khalig, which passes through Cairo, but it only goes as far as the lagoon, called the Lake of

Sheib. The remainder, as far as the Red Sea, is entirely filled up, although some traces of it are still distinguishable.'

"We have thought it necessary to quote the entire passage, because it clearly establishes the question of the canal, and certain facts to which we shall return hereafter.

"After Amron came Sultan Mustapha III., *who took great interest in the scheme for the junction of the two seas by the Isthmus of Suez;* and who intended to execute this work in a time of peace. (See *Mémoires sur les Turcs*, by M. de Tott, Parts iii. and iv.)

"M. Lepère proposed, it is true, the track of the secondary canal between Alexandria and the interior of Egypt; but his opinion upon the direct track by the Isthmus of Suez, is expressed in these terms:—

"'In this project of the canal of Suez, we have expressly based the choice of the ancient direction by the interior of the Delta, towards Alexandria, upon commercial considerations peculiar to Egypt, and upon the fact that the coast near Pelusium does not appear to allow of a permanent maritime establishment. Nevertheless, we think it right to acknowledge that, waiving these considerations, it would still be easy (although, on the contrary, it appeared difficult, and even dangerous, before the invention of locks) to open a direct communication between Suez, the Bitter Lakes, and the Ras-el-Moyeh, continued upon the eastern bank of the Lake Menzaleh, as far as the sea, near Pelusium.

"'We think that a canal opened in this direction would have an advantage *which the interior canal would not.* In fact there might be constant navigation upon it, which would not be subject to the alteration of the rising and decreasing of the Nile. It would be easy to maintain a greater depth in it than in the first canal, by means of a current, fed by the immense reservoir of the Bitter Lakes. . . . I will add, that if I did not perceive some difficulties in excavating and maintaining at a proper depth, the channel between Suez and the road-

stead, I would propose to establish a direct communication between the two seas by the Isthmus, for the use of corvettes, and even of frigates, which will become the complement of this grand and important operation.'

"It will be seen then (says M. de Lesseps), that M. Lepère himself acknowledged that the direct track was the most advantageous for the commerce of the world, while the interior canal was especially advantageous to Egypt. It is evident that with the two canals, the one direct on a large section, the other on a small section, and both derived from the Nile, all interests are most abundantly satisfied." . . .

"The advantage of the new track being thus sufficiently proved from a general point of view, we shall now enter into the details of the scheme, with regard to its execution. We will begin with the levelling of the line from Pelusium to Suez. These levels were taken by some engineers attached to the French expedition, and the difference between the level of high water at Suez, and of low water at Sineh, was found to be 9 met., 90, in favour of the Red Sea. Although this result has been explained by geological and historical considerations, the fact appeared so extraordinary, that several travellers came to the spot to verify it. Some English officers, amongst others, operating first with the barometer, and afterwards with the boiling water process, were not able to discover any perceptible difference between the levels of the two seas. These investigations, published in a pamphlet, which has come before us, and which were known to the learned world, had occasioned much uncertainty, when, in 1847, a society was established for the investigation of the Isthmus of Suez, and at the head of which were M. M. Négrelli, Robert Stephenson, and Talabot, and caused a complete survey to be made by French engineers, under the direction of M. Bourdaloue, well known for his improved methods of levelling, and his numerous labours in that particular branch. These able and experienced surveyors, provided with good instruments, and accompanied by a numerous staff, were

formed into several divisions, which operated separately, and thus were able to obtain divers verifications.

"M. Sabatier, Consul General of France in Egypt, having been informed of the wish of some learned Frenchmen to have a fresh verification, spontaneously applied to the Viceroy of Egypt, and one of us was appointed to undertake it in consequence.

"The verification was made in 1853. It resulted in favour of the surveyors of 1847. For the new levels only differ a fraction of a metre from those of 1847, and give as the difference between the station on the quay of the hotel at Suez, and low water in the Mediterranean two metres 4286, instead of two metres 6100, found by the operations in 1847.

"There cannot be a moment's hesitation in making choice between the levellings of 1799 and those of 1847 and 1853, for the two latter were taken under the most favorable circumstances by experienced surveyors provided with the best instruments, and were verified several times without finding any perceptible difference by these varions verifications; whilst the levelling of 1799 was undertaken in the midst of the vicissitudes and dangers of warfare, in a hostile country, and in a climate to which the engineers were not accustomed.

"Supposing, therefore, the bed of the canal to be established at the depth of six metres—50 below low water in the Mediterranean, the greatest excavation would be at the bar of *El Guisr*, and would show a total depth of 16 metres, 50, which is nothing extraordinary, supposing it even twenty metres. The requisite excavation would bear no comparison with what was executed in Mexico during the Spanish occupation."

The subject of the comparative levels of the Red Sea and Mediterranean is thus referred to, in the very able report of the International Commission, published in 1856.

"Since the operation of taking the level by M. Lepère in 1799, it has been generally admitted, for nearly half a century, that the Red Sea had an elevation about 9 metres, 908, at the

high tide at the sea at Suez above the level of the Mediterranean at Pelusium at ebb tide. When this result became known to the savans of Europe, at the beginning of this century, there were only a few superior minds, and those were small in number, who called it in question. Amongst those who protested against it were the great Laplace and the illustrious Fourier. Both did so on grounds purely theoretic, believing that the equilibrium of the waters on the surface of the globe did not admit of a possibility of this phenomena. Laplace had not been in Egypt. But Fourier took part in the Egyptian expedition, but not in the geometrical operations of its savans. The difference in the level of the two seas set forth by M. Lepère and his colleagues, was in perfect accordance with the tradition which had been accepted and transmitted down to their times from the highest antiquity. It came at least from the time of Aristotle, who, in his Meteorology (Lib. 1, cap. 14) had said that the Red Sea was higher than the soil of Egypt, and that Sesostris, who had commenced digging a canal, was obliged to cease that work, as at a later period Darius was obliged to do; because, fearing that the Red Sea when it came to mingle with the Nile, might not completely destroy the course of it. This idea has been often re-produced since the time of Aristotle, and it is not improbable that it had some influence on the erroneous conclusion that M. Lepère had come to.*

A few references to the sites of the ancient canals and the several localites made mention of by M. de Lesseps may not be misplaced here.

The first attempt to connect the Red Sea with the Mediterranean we are told by Herodotus was made by Sesostris.

In this attempt 100,000 lives were sacrificed, it is said.

Nechos consulted an oracle on the subject of the undertaking and the response might have come from Downing Street, if Downing Street had then been in existence. "The canal will open Egypt to the invasion of strangers."

* Percement de D'Isthme de Suez, par. M. F. de Lesseps. Paris, 1856.

The canal was completed, however, so far as to admit of merchandize being conveyed from the Nile to the Red Sea.

Trajan and the renowned Saracen, Amron, Caliph Omar's Egyptian Governor, re-opened the canal at intervals of about 500 years.

The only remains of it serviceable now is a small portion at Cairo called the Kalisch.

The level of the Red Sea up to a very late period was erroneously considered to be thirty feet higher than the Mediterranean, and fifteen feet higher than the Nile at the lowest period of the waters of that river at Cairo, and five feet lower than the Nile at its highest period.

The remains of the old canal on the borders of the Pelusiac mouth of the Nile are connected with sites of ancient cities renowned in Hebrew lore.

Rae Wilson has erroneously described Mansoura, as the Zoan of the sacred volume; Danville, however, and Hamilton are good authorities, and they describe San as the site of the ancient Zoan.

"Samna," says Danville, "was the ancient Tanis; it took in the translation of the Septuagint made in Egypt, the name of Tzoan, from which San is derived."

"It is singular," says Hamilton, "that Josephus should designate in this way the ruins of a vast city, which had been rendered so conspicuous by the curses denounced against it by the prophets of his country, and fulfilled by the avenging hand of heaven. But it was now several centuries since the mighty Zoan had been levelled with the dust; and a scene of desolation had succeeded to the abundance and wealth of a metropolis." "It is mentioned in the Itineray of Antoine as being forty four miles from Pelusium, which seems to agree with the admeasurement lately made. Larcher, in his notes on the translation of Herodotus, has endeavoured to prove that the ancient name of Tanis is only applicable to the Island of Thennesus, notwithstanding that the Hebrew Zoan is uniformly rendered Tanis in the Septuagint.

That it was an ancient city we have the testimony of the Scriptures. "Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt."

"It was here," says Hamilton, "the Pharaohs had their splendid palaces; it was here that Moses performed his miracles before them; 'Marvellous things did he in the sight of their father in the land of Egypt in the field of Zoan;' and here in the vicinity of Salehie, lay that pasture land which was the Goshen of the Hebrews."

Bryant in speaking of the space between the Pelusiac branch and the Red Sea, says, "The Jews who during their captivity betook themselves to this country, thought it no despicable spot to settle in."

The country between San and Salehie, now on the verge of the desert, was probably the Goshen of the Hebrews. The interest excited by controversies on this subject, and that also of the channel of the ancient canal from Suez to the Nile determines a route of mine nearly thirty five years ago by Salehie and Pelusium to Suez. "That San is the site of that Zoan where Moses performed the miracles before Phoraoh, and that the Israelites took their departure from that city, and journied through that desert, on the verge of which their Goshen was situated, is taken for granted by some of our best informed travellers. When the children of Israel journied from Rameses to Succoth, "about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children," their route it is supposed was from San to Salehie fifteen miles from Zoan: and from thence to the vicinity of the modern Suez. The first account of their arrival at the Red Sea is when they "encamp at Pihahiroth, betwen Migdol and the sea, over against Baalzephon."*

After waiting at San three days for our Bedouin guides, they at last arrived; and at five the next morning we set out for Suez.

Elsewhere I have given an account of a journey of mine to

* Madden's Travels in the East, vol. ii., p. 180.

Suez, and of the remains of the ancient canal and its vicinity, at a period when railway travelling was not in being in the land of the Pharaohs.

"At the extremity of the Gulf of Suez, five or six miles from the town, I observed a portion of the remains of the ancient canal which joined the Nile: the bank on the eastern side is from eight to ten feet high, and the breadth of the canal appears to have been thirty feet; it runs north north-west, and, on the route from Salehie, its course may be traced for half a day in that direction. The Saline marshes which extend fifteen or eighteen miles from Suez, in the direction of Salehie, mark its bed. Hamilton thought he saw the termination of this canal in the Nile, near Belbeis, and Burckhardt has laid down its course in the direction of Belbeis, but I believe it terminated in the Pelusiac branch of the Nile near Salehie; for here, on the left of our route, towards Suez, I found the bed of an ancient canal, much wider than any of the modern ones; and, as I could trace its course in a southerly direction for about fifty yards, I thought it very probable that it was the continuation of the canal from Suez. It is supposed its course, in Burckhardt's map, is too much to the west; instead of turning off towards Belbeis, it should be traced north north-west, in the direction of Salehie.

Strabo speaks of this canal falling into the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, and of its being anterior to the siege of Troy; other authors ascribed its construction to Necho, and its perfection to one of the Ptolemies.*

The *Lake Muzale* is only five miles distant from Damietta, and the voyage to *San* is commonly accomplished in two days.

The ancient geography of *Menzalé*, and its vicinity in the Delta, is of so much importance in determining the site of the canal from Suez to the Nile, and more especially the spot where Zoan stood, that it may not be amiss to mention the

* Madden's Travels in the East, vol. 2, p. 227.

modern canals and outlets which mark the seven ancient branches of the Nile.

The Canal of Kelioub marks the Pelusiac Branch.
The Canal of Moes marks the Tanitic do.
The Canal of Ashmoum marks the Mendesian do.
The Canal of Bebek Bourlos marks the Sebennytic do.
The Bogaz of Damietta marks the Phatnitic do.
The Bogaz of Rosetta marks the Bolbitine do.
The old Canal of Aboukir marks the Canopic do.

Of these, two only of the original mouths are now remaining,—the Damietta and Rosetta branches. The French found the extreme length of the lake to be forty-three thousand fathoms, and its extreme width twelve thousand, But from my own observation of the time required to traverse it, I should judge it to be sixty-five miles long and fifteen broad.*

The lake *Menzalé*, properly speaking, is not a maritime lake, but formed by the increase of the Damietta branch of the Nile,† at the expense of the *Tanitic* and *Mendesian* branches; and thereby, the sea having no opposition to its passage through the dry channels of the latter branches; the depth of the lake is from three to five feet, and on pushing an oar to the bottom, I have observed it coated with the common mud of the Nile, for about twenty inches deep.

About twelve miles from Metariéh, we entered the canal of *Moes*, which takes the name of *Meshrah* for six miles; about five miles more from the mouth, the canal is dammed up to prevent the influx of the salt water of the lake.‡

So much for the sites of the old canals referred to by M. de Lesseps.

On the first report of the international commissioners, the Viceroy confirmed the first concession to M. de Lesseps by a second charter, dated 30th November, 1854, on ascertaining that the Porte would raise no obstacle to the undertaking.

* Madden's Travels in the East, Vol. ii. p. 170.
† Herodotus says, the Damietta branch, was dug by the inhabitants.
‡ Madden's Travels in the East, Vol. ii. p. 175.

The next step of M. de Lesseps was the organization of resources for the project. He tells us, in his work, published in 1856, that "a number of capitalists in the Ottoman Empire, in Germany, Italy, Holland, France, Spain, and Belgium, had offered to advance the scheme by advances, the amount of which was already more than sufficient for its requirements."

But there is no mention made of any advances, or prospect of any assistance at the hands of British capitalists. M. de Lesseps could not, however, avoid recognising the considerable amount of cold water that was generously contributed in the British Press, in Parliament, and in official publications in our Blue Books, and thrown unsparingly on the scheme of the Suez Maritime Canal, by a French projector.

When the scheme was approved and adopted by Said Pacha, "a concession" was formally given to M. de Lesseps, coupled with certain remarkable conditions, one of which, must have largely, or rather mainly contributed to the determination come to by the international commissioners, to the following effect:—

"After having passed in review the numerous projects submitted to various governments, or to the public for more than fifty years, I grant perfect liberty for the application of those means that science shall recognise to be best to bring the Red Sea and the Mediterranean into communication, at any point of the Isthmus, eastward of the course of the Nile; but I declare that I will not authorise the Grand Maritime Suez Canal Company, to adopt any track which shall have its point of departure on the Mediterranean coast, to the west of the Damietta branch, and which shall traverse the course of the Nile."

By the terms of the Firman of Concession, granted to M. de Lesseps in 1854, by the Viceroy of Egypt.

1. Mr. Lesseps is charged with the formation of a Company for the construction of the Maritime Canal.

2. The Director of the Company is to be always appointed by the Egyptian Government.

3. The term of the grant is for 99 years from the date of opening the Canal.

4. The works to be executed at the cost of the Company. The necessary land required for the Canal and Ports, not belonging to private persons, to be granted by the Government, free of cost. The fortifications the Government may think proper to erect, to be at the cost of Government.

5. The Government to receive from the Company annually 15 per cent. of the nett profits.

6. The tariff of dues for the passage of the Canal of Suez, to be regulated by the government and the agents between the Company and theVice Roy.

7. In case the Company see fit to connect the Nile with the Maritime Canal, the Viceroy would give up to the Company the uncultivated government lands, that shall be irrigated and cultivated by the Company for ten years, free of taxation.

8. The land required for the Maritime Canal, and the branch one connecting it with the Nile, not to be made objects of speculation.

9. The Company shall be allowed to use all mines and quarries of the public domain, for the works of the Canal and erections connected with it, and shall be exempted from dues on the importation of all machines and materials.

10. At the expiration of the term of the grant, the Egyptian Government to take the place of the Company, and to enjoy all the rights of the latter. The plant and moveables to be taken by agreement or arbitration.

11. The statutes of the company must be submitted to the government, and have its sanction and approbation.

12. The Viceroy will give his true co-operation and that of all the functionaries of Egypt to the undertaking.

The works not to commence until they are authorised by the Porte.

Alexandria, May, 19, 1855.

In M. de Lesseps's memorial, in 1854, to the Viceroy of Egypt, setting forth the advantages of the projected maritime canal, a table is given shewing the comparative distances between several European ports and Bombay *via* Suez, and by the long sea

voyage through the Straits of Gibraltar, and the saving by the Suez maritime canal route.

PORTS. From	DISTANCE TO BOMBAY IN LEAGUES. *Viâ* Suez.	*Viâ* Cape of Good Hope.	DIFFERENCE. Distance saved.
London	5,950	3,100	2,850
Trieste	5,960	2,340	3,620
St. Petersburg ...	6,550	3,700	2,850
Marseilles	5,650	2,374	3,276
Amsterdam	5,950	3,100	2,850
Lisbon	5,350	2,500	2,850
Constantinople ...	6,100	1,800	4,300

In the second English publication of M. de Lesseps, published in 1856, a table is given of the distances in marine miles (of 1852 metres), between the principal commercial ports of Europe and America to Ceylon, as more justly to be considered a central port for the Indian and Chinese seas, from which the following data are taken:—

PORTS. From	DISTANCE TO CEYLON IN MILES. *Viâ* Cape of Good Hope.	*Viâ* Suez	DIFFERENCE. Distance saved.
London	14,340	7,300	7,040
Trieste	15,480	5,220	10,260
St. Petersburg ...	15,660	8,620	7,040
Marseilles	14,500	5,490	9,010
Amsterdam	14,460	7,420	7,040
Lisbon	13,500	6,190	7,310
Constantinople ...	15,630	4,700	10,930

In the second English publication, edited by M. de Lesseps, "Minister Plenipotentiary," that appeared in 1856, entitled "New Facts and Figures relative to the Suez Canal, with a reply of M. B. de St. Hilaire, to the Edinburgh Reviewers," we are informed that M. de Lesseps invited the civil engineers of the principal European nations to form an international Commission of Inquiry, to examine on the spot the several projects for the accomplishment of the proposed undertaking. A commission was accordingly appointed, in which it is said the engineering science of England, France, Austria, Prussia, Italy, Holland and Belgium were represented.

The commissioners met in Paris in Oct. 1855, and it was determined that a majority of the members should proceed to Egypt.

In Dec. 1855 the commissioners commenced their inquiries and examinations at Suez, and terminated them at Pelusium. The results of their labours are the following conclusions, which M. de Lesseps says, "The scientific world may henceforth look upon as ascertained facts."

The bay or gulph of Pelusium has undeservedly been always held in bad repute. The sea of mud, which is said to exist there, "is a perfect chimera," the waters are limped, the shore is composed of fine smooth sand. At three miles' distance from the beach no trace of mud was to be found, and no mud banks were in existence, which, it had been asserted confidently, did exist, and must render navigation impossible in these inhospitable waters. The commissioners spent a month examining the bay and the coast of Pelusium, taking soundings with great care and accuracy. The Gulph of Pelusium facing the north-east is 60 kilometres in breadth and 20 in depth, and is bordered by a narrow belt of fine sand, not moveable, which during the memory of man has not undergone any material change in form. In advance of this narrow sand belt out at sea there is a zone of fine sand similar to that on the beach, and ending at a depth of about 10 metres, "*at which point commences an immense bed of* mud, advancing far into the depths of the sea. The bottom has throughout a regular slope, and gradual inclination. Its greatest inclination is facing the height of Tennis, where a depth of 8 metres exists at a distance of 2300 metres from the beach. To the west it continues much the same as far as Damietta, but eastward it sensibly diminishes up to Pelusium, where a depth of 8 metres is not found until 7,500 metres from the shore. Winds from the W.N.W. prevail two-thirds of the year, and in winter are the most violent. The currents are nearly imperceptible. *The deposits of sand in the Gulph of Pelusium are as ancient as the Nile itself, and yet their increase during the lapse of ages is inappreciable.*

"From all these observations, it becomes evident that in forming a harbour in the Gulph of Pelusium, there would be nothing to fear from accumulations brought by the waters of the Nile."

The only cause for apprehension would be in the shifting sands driven in various directions by storms from the N. W. and N. E. But this danger is to be obviated by carrying out the entrance to the harbour as far as the belt of mud.

The materials for the construction of the harbour would have to be brought along the shores of Syria, from the islands of Cyprus, Rhodes, or Scarpanto.

The commissioners returned to Alexandria, and from Pelusium to the former port the length of the voyage in the Egyptian frigate "the Nile" was twenty hours.

On their arrival at Alexandria, they reported to the Viceroy "That the direct canal from Pelusium to Suez was the only solution to the problem, and that there existed no other practical manner of joining the Red Sea with the Mediterranean; that the execution of this maritime canal was easy and its success certain. That the two harbours required to be constructed at Suez and Pelusium presented no difficulties but such as were of an ordinary character. The harbour at Suez would open on a spacious and safe roadstead, accessible in all weathers, and in which a depth of eight metres is found at 1,600 metres from the shore; that at Pelusium, being situated between the mouths of Oum Fareg and Oum Ghemilè, in a region where a depth of eight metres is found at 2,300 metres from the shore the bottom presents a good hold. Finally, the Commission declared that the total expense would not exceed the sum stated in the precursory scheme—200,000,000 of francs, or in sterling £6,400,000."

The Viceroy, at the time of his approval of the project, is made to appear a generous contributor to the great undertaking. "The Viceroy of Egypt," says M. de Lesseps, "was the first to come forward with a subscription to the amount of 30,000,000 of francs (upwards of a million sterling), and to subscribe an

additional two millions of francs as an investment for the benefit of the officers and soldiers of his army." If the tenth part of the amount *subscribed* by His Highness was actually paid down, the Viceroy of Egypt, in 1855, must have been in a happier position than he was in in 1860, when I was last in Egypt, to be able to subscribe 30,000,000 of francs for a project of very uncertain accomplishment, and to invest in it 2,000,000 for his army.

At the period of my visit, the payment of his army and his civil employés had been in arrear upwards of eighteen months, indeed his government was in a state of insolvency.

M. B. de St. Helaire, Member of the Institute of France, who accompanied the International Commission to Suez and Pelusium on the mission of inquiry and investigation, replying to an adverse article on M. de Lesseps's scheme, published in the "Edinburgh Review," of Jan. 1856, says, the two positions taken by the reviewer, which are specious, and need to be refuted, are the following :—

1st. That the proposed Maritime Canal is impracticable on account of the very great difficulties which must be encountered in the roadstead of Suez, and on account of the absolutely insurmountable difficulties which are presented in the Bay of Pelusium.

2nd. That even if the project were practicable and acually accomplished, it would be useless to commerce, because the Red Sea is very nearly impracticable to sailing vessels, and the saving in point of distance by means of the Maritime Canal, would be more than counterbalanced by the enormous obstacles which would have to be encountered in those seas.

It is not necessary in this place to refer either to the details of the Edinburgh Reviewer's objections, or M. St. Helaire's extensive refutations.

Objections to the Suez Canal Project.

In the summer of 1860 a very valuable paper was presented o the British Parliament in return to an order of the House of Commons, dated the 9th of Feb., 1860, intitled:

Extracts from an inquiry into the soundness of M. De Lesseps's Reasonings and Arguments on the practicability of the Suez Canal. By Captain T. Spratt, R.N., C.B., F.R.S.

The projects, we are told by Captain Spratt, embrace two classes of engineering works, viz.—the cutting a gigantic canal through the isthmus; and the formation of a sea-port or deep entrance into it, from a tideless and shallow sea, in the vicinity of one of the larger class rivers.

It is quite evident that this canal is dependent upon or secondary to the practicability of making and maintaining a deep entrance to it from the tideless Mediterranean.

And it is argued and asserted by M. de Lesseps, the great mover of this question, that the harbour on either side presents no difficulty that engineering skill cannot surmount, and consistent with its practicability as a commercial project.

Those arguments and reasonings are based upon one or two very extraordinary and important views, viz., that the sea coast of Egypt is now mainly, indeed entirely, the result of a maritime production, and consequently that the anciently apprehended difficulty respecting the filling up of any harbour formed to the eastward of the Nile, and so near to it as M. de Lesseps proposes, is not founded on a true knowledge of the local influences; although asserted so long ago as the days of Herodotus, when Egypt was both far more populous and far more enlightened than at this time, so that the founder of Alexandria was guided by the local opinions in respect to the proper position for the site of this city and port, that was intended to be the emporium of the world.

And all M. de Lesseps's arguments in consequence tend to

prove this assertion, by endeavouring to show that the accumulations on the shore of the Delta are now due to a sea origin only; and thus rendering the depositions of the mighty Nile as *nil*, or of none effect.

Much of this assertion may startle a reflecting mind who has at all studied the effect of rivers in other localities; much as it may startle also the geographer, geologist, and hydrographer, as a remarkable assertion to make in the middle of the nineteenth century, yet from the manner it has been discussed and treated in some of its points and facts connected with the local conditions, the reason seems to be in a measure sound: I mean on a superficial investigation of them.

Because the ruins of Pelusium seem to be not much farther removed from the sea than when Strabo wrote, and because the mouths of the Nile also have not advanced at any remarkable amount for such a river for many centuries.

But does this really prove that the Nile has ceased to exercise any influence on the shallows of the Bay of Pelusium or its adjacent coast?—for this is the real point of the question; and is such an apparent anomaly amongst rivers such a remarkable exception to the previously entertained laws of other rivers—the Danube, the Po, and as the Rhine, true?

Especially when it is so well known that Egypt owes its fertility to the annual depositions from the Nile to the more superficial and therefore lighter portions of its suspended matter; the heavier and grosser being of course rolled and carried along in the lower part of this great stream.

Such an assertion, then, is indeed startling, in the face of the entertained notions regarding the influences of rivers in all other parts of the world, and from the manner in which it has been argued by M. de Lesseps, it has been successfully received by the commercial communities of England, France, and Austria, who have been invited to risk their millions in the project, from thus believing it a remunerative and practicable undertaking, because apparently founded upon a profound and sound

knowledge of the local conditions and difficulties that are to be contended with.

Thus the argument and reasonings of M. de Lesseps go to prove that the coast of Africa and Egypt, from Tripoli to Syria, is composed of a similar alluvium, being covered with sand-banks, which owe their origin to the abrasion of the sea; but that from some unknown reason their originating causes have ceased to operate upon this coast, and this he endeavours to prove by the following passage, which seems to confirm his arguments, and to be the rock of his theory and project:—

"Now it appears that for many ages the sands have ceased to extend the Pelusiac shore, as is manifested from the well-ascertained position of Pelusium, the ruins of which still remain. Strabo, in his 'Itinerary,' says that Pelusium is situated at the distance of 20 stadia from the sea; the French engineers of the expedition have verified this distance by measuring 1,600 toises, or 3,000 metres, from its remains to the shore."

In 1847 the distance between these two points had not varied, as it is marked on the plan with the figure 3,000 metres, and at the present day it is still the same."

In fact, by reading all the accounts of ancient authors, and comparing them with what actually exists, we arrive at the conclusion that the shores of the Delta have varied very little in historic times."

The sea sands, then, have long ceased to accumulate, and the fact may be explained by assuming that the destruction of the coasts of Morocco, Algeria, Candia, and other parts, which destruction, we repeat, alone furnishes the materials of maritime alluvium, has abated, from some cause or other. It may also be assumed that the sands which were formerly driven by winds and currents into the Gulf of Pelusium, are now cast on the African coast, between Tripoli and Alexandria, and driven inland in the shape of downs.

The fact is that no new doons are now seen forming the Isthmus; those on the sea shore being of ancient formation,

and nearly all naturally fixed by vegetation. In conclusion, the extension of the Pelusiac shore, if such extension there be, is too insignificant to be taken into consideration.

Thus, by the assumptions of M. de Lesseps, the laws of nature are suspended, ancient opinions and apprehensions are denied, modern experience also set at naught, because the shore at Pelusium has apparently advanced but little on the sea since the days of Strabo.

Surely a project involving the expenditure of eight or ten millions is not to be based upon such assumptions or assertions. For they are not, in my humble judgment and experience, a true solution of the question, or a true investigation of nature, or founded on sound reasonings. . . .

On inspecting a chart of the coast, it will be seen also that the coast and shallows off Alexandria are for the most part rocky and not sandy, as M. de Lesseps states, and so is the greater part of the coast to the westward as far as Cyrene, being formed of rocky headlands and a rocky shore line, that are the roots or salient prongs of mountain ranges.

For Alexandria, or rather Abou-kir Castle, stands upon the termination of this rocky shore, which once no doubt jutted out into the sea as a long peninsula of land, being elevated from 50 to 100 feet above it.

And immediately off, and to the westward of Alexandria, the sea is deep; there being upwards of 100 feet depth at only two miles distance from the shore, whilst off the bay of Pelusium that depth does not exist nearer than twenty miles, so that this fact at once indicates that in advancing to the westward of the Nile we are departing from the true origin of these vast shallows and sand-banks which extend off the coast, and form the Suez Isthmus and Nile Delta.

Thus the coast abrasion theory of M. de Lesseps is at fault, an evident fallacy at the first step of the investigation on the line from whence he attributes the ancient origin of these accumulations, viz., from Tripoli and Morocco.

It is necessary and just to the commercial interest desiring

to embark in the project of M. de Lesseps to know these important facts ere they risk their millions in the undertaking, instead of discovering them only when swamped in the sands they will have to contend against; and then to discover also, when too late to amend it, that Alexander the Great was wiser than M. de Lesseps admits, when he listened to the local opinion regarding the influence of the Nile upon his harbour, if formed to the eastward of it. At least, with all due deference to the judgment of that able gentleman, the above facts and my hydrographic experience of the Mediterranean, observes Captain Spratt, extending over a period of twenty years, teach me to believe so.

(Signed) T. SPRATT,
Captain, R.N.

Malta, 30 January, 1858.

EXTRACTS from an INVESTIGATION of the Effect of the Prevailing Wave Influence on the NILE'S Deposits, and upon the Littoral of its Delta.

By Captain SPRATT, R.N.

THE effect of the prevailing wave stroke on the littoral drift of matter discharged from the Nile's embouchures is undoubtedly a point of much importance in the consideration of the practicability of maintaining a harbour in Pelusium Bay. And conceiving, from my experience of the Delta of the Danube and elsewhere, that as the prevailing winds, and therefore the prevailing wave movement and currents on the coast of Egypt, are from the north-west and westward, the small extension of the shores of the delta to seaward is thus accounted for, in causing a littoral dispersion of the Nile's deposit of sand and mud, viz., to the eastward: and as far even as the shores of Syria, that is since the shores of the delta have advanced so far north as to be within reach of their influence. Consequently, that to the westward of the Nile, and so near to it as Alexandria, the Nile's influence was probably *nil*; and that even directly off the coast,

the Nile's influence would probably be found to extend but for a few miles only.

To test this view I commenced an examination of the sea shore and sea bottom at different depths off the whole Egyptian coast; and then compared their result with those obtained from the banks of the Nile at different localities, from the shallows of its bed in the middle of the delta, and also from those found at its apex near Cairo; as places affording true indications of the matter which the river annually transports and deposits in the sea.

* * * * * *

The westerly gales and prevailing north-west breezes are undoubtedly the accumulating and moving causes of this stream of sand dunes which extend from Cape Brulos to Damietta; for as fast as the wind removes the sun-dried sand from the beach, the surf re-accumulates it again during every gale.

This was not only evident, by an examination at two or three intermediate localities, but was confirmed by the natives wherever I landed upon the shore. At times it completely buries the huts of the coast guardsmen; and during strong gales from the westward (the quarter they all describe as that from whence the sand comes) it is not possible to walk against it.

The piercing of the Alps for a railway is comprehensible, as a possible project, because on the day the passage is opened, the main difficulties are overcome. But to endeavour to contend in perpetuity by dredging or by prolongation of piers against the whole littoral movement of the Nile's deposit upon the embouchure of a dead-water harbour, is only the commencement of a perpetual difficulty, connected with the gigantic engineering project of the proposed canalisation of the Isthmus of Suez, with a channel of 27 feet deep. For every gale will obstruct the navigation, and crowd the bay and canal with detained shipping—will renew the obstruction and difficulty of

ingress and egress, by throwing forward continually the sands and moving matter upon the mouth of the harbour, and raising its shallows: and these to an amount of which, in my humble opinion, the dispersal of my eleven bags of clinkers after only twelve days of the month of May weather gives but a very insignificant idea, especially, too, as at the season of north-west and westerly breezes, the Nile is at its high condition, and, therefore, discharging a large quantity of matter into the sea, as its turbid nature along the whole coast at that season fully shows.

In a gigantic engineering project, involving such an enormous outlay for its construction, as well as its annual maintenance, as these facts suggest, it is necessary that the commercial interests invited to speculate in it should thoroughly understand it, so as to form an opinion whether millions of money will not be fruitlessly lost in the deths of the sea, as I must believe will be the case. The experience of the past in the difficulties of engineering against similar hydraulic and physical conditions elsewhere should not be forgotten, and to none are such facts as are here stated of more value and of more real importance than to M. de Lesseps and the International Commission. At least, such is the humble opinion of one, whose only object is to arrive at the truth of nature's laws, and suggest to others the consideration of those truths, before blindly engineering against them; and hence to be certain of the cost and results, before undertaking a work that will have to contend against so vast an amount of physical difficulties in perpetuity.

With this conviction, I leave the question; apologising, at the same time, for intruding upon the arguments connected with the canal part of the project.

But I leave it with this observation, that I find from the different borings made across the Isthmus, to ascertain its nature at the depths required for the proposed canal, and especially across the Lake of Menzaleh and the northern part of the line, that sand greatly predominates in the depths below the level of the surface

water of the Mediterranean; viz., sable blanc, sable, sable de mer, sable vaseux, vase sableuse, &c. (*See* Sections published by M. de Lesseps.) Is not all this sand identical with the quartzose sand of the Nile, although sometimes called sea sand? And will not the infiltration through the sides of a canal, excavated in such loose matter, and at a level so much below the sea and the Nile, more than keep pace with any amount of dredging which it may be possible to apply, consistent with maintaining the navigation open? For this infiltration of sand from the sides of such canals within the delta, by the Commission's own showing, defeats all efforts to contend against it when dug below the Nile's low-water level, as the following extract explains (Section XV., 3d Series): "It appeared to them (the Commission) impossible to maintain in proper repair a canal, the bottom of which was below the line of low water in the Nile, otherwise than by enormous expenditure; and even if incurring this cost, it was uncertain whether the desired result would be obtained. In all cases when an attempt has been to dig a canal below the low-water level, and more especially on the outskirts of the desert in the Ghattal Bay, for instance, it invariably happens that about the level of low water a bed of loose sand is met with, as was the case at Masteroud. This constitutes an enormous difficulty, and a source of expense of which it is hardly possible to form any previous estimate. In the case of the Moëze, all attempts to dredge it have been given up." Here then is an opinion, supported by facts, that really deserves to be kept prominently in mind, in any discussion on the practicability of the canalisation of the Isthmus of Suez. Neither must the great preponderance of sand which the sections of borings across the Isthmus show to be present, be lost sight of, for this sand is there below the low-water level of the Nile and Mediterranean, all of it on the direct line of the proposed canal, and which, I believe, came from the Nile, but was transported there by the sea in ancient days.

(Signed) T. Spratt,
Captain, Her Majesty's Ship "Medina."

Alexandria, 9 July, 1858.

The opinions expressed in Captain Spratt's communications to the British Government on the Suez Canal project, are certainly very unfavourable to that gigantic undertaking. I regret to say the results of all my inquiries in Egypt on this subsubject, and some of them of persons (Frenchmen) who had been actually engaged in the preparatory engineering operations at Suez coincide entirely with Captain Spratt's sentiments as to the utter impracticability of the undertaking.

The grand difficulty of the projected undertaking, in my opinion, is that of maintaining a maritime canal, of about seventy-five miles in length, passing through a desert, from being filled up by sand and weeds.

So far back as 1825, when I first ascended the Nile, *via* the Mahmoudieh Canal, that connects the great river with the Mediterranean, the then newly-made canal was all but impassable for boats deeply laden, from the accumulation of slime and sand at the mouth of the canal, and the enormous quantity of sedges, and weeds of luxuriant growth throughout the entire channel.

In 1854 the canal was rendered almost useless on account of the same impediments. The Viceroy was prevailed on to make a grand effort to get rid of this strong argument against the new project of a canal of far greater length, and more than treble the width, and accordingly, 115,000 men were set to work, and in less than a month the choked canal was cleansed and to some extent cleared with very little loss of life, compared with the enormous expenditure of that very cheap commodity in Egypt, in the making of that canal.

The great work of Mohammed Ali, the Mahmoudieh Canal, was commenced and finished within a year. The number of the poor inhabitants of Upper Egypt carried away from their native villages, of either sex, and of all ages, except those of infancy and senile decrepitude, was 250,000. There was no provision made for them of any kind, except for the first month —a scanty supply of food. The multitude of hard-worked, maltreated, half-famished labourers, perished by thousands, to the extent of 25,000 in the short space of ten months.

The Nile is said by M. Linant, the chief engineer of Mohammed Ali, to pour into the sea by the two mouths—Rosetta and Damietta—in every twenty-four hours 705,514 metres.

The elevation of its waters below the first cataract at Assouan —a distance from the mouths of the river at Rosetta and Damietta—is 543 French feet above the Mediterranean. At the full, it runs at the rate of about three miles an hour, and at the fall at about two miles. The accumulation of deposit from the Nile is estimated by Linant at about four inches in a century in Lower Egypt; a rate of increase that would give about forty feet of soil in the interval from the Deluge to our times.

The inundation of the Nile begins in May, reaches to its height in August, and from that time diminishes.

The canal that communicates between Alexandria and the Nile is 44 miles in length (not 20 leagues as M. de Lesseps very erroneously states), 90 feet in breadth, and from 15 to 18 feet deep. It was opened by Mahommed Ali in 1819. The usual mode of conducting public works in Egypt was practised in the making of the Mahmudie Canal; vast multitudes of the unfortunate peasantry were seized by the military in the several provinces, and embarked on the Nile for the scene of operation, and where, in the progress of the work, twenty thousand perished from want of food, houseing, or care of any kind. Six years after the completion of this work, when I first visited Egypt, in 1825, even then—I repeat the significant fact—the canal was beginning to be choked up at the mouth entering the Nile, and when I again visited Egypt in 1840, the canal was quite impassable, for boats of a large size heavily laden. When I next visited Egypt, the canal had just been rendered navigable for large boats, the bed having been considerably widened; but the railway, opened in 1859, has now rendered the canal of minor importance.

Alexandria is about fourteen miles W.S.W. of the Canopic mouth of the Nile.

Alexandria is the only port in the north-western coast of

Egypt in which there is deep water and security for shipping throughout the year. The misnamed ports of Rosetta and Damietta are, in fact, only roadsteads, and even these are difficult of access, each having a bar on which there is always a dangerous surf. Rosetta is on the western branch, and Damietta on the eastern branch of the Nile. Under the Ptolemies, Alexandria was at the height of its greatness. It was then the first commercial city in the world, and continued so to be under the Romans. Its conquest by the Saracens in 640, A.D., was the first great blow to its prosperity and magnificence; the Regime of the Mamelukes and Turks was the next; the discovery of the route to India by the Cape of Good Hope, in 1498, was the coup de grace to the Great Emporium of the Eastern world.*

In considering the Suez Canal project, the commerce and agricultural produce have to be taken into account.

The computed value of the products of Egypt imported from that country into Great Britain and Ireland in 1857, Mc'Culloch estimates at (in sterling) £7,853,876, and the declared value of British and Irish produce exported to Egypt the same year, £1,899,289. With respect to the cotton imported from Egypt into Great Britain and Ireland in 1857, Mc'Culloch returns the quantity at 219,038 cwts., and the value thereof £971,744. The weight of a bale of Egyptian cotton at Alexandria averages 230 rottoli, or 228 lbs. English, and a fraction. Allowing 12 rottoli as tare for sacking and cordage, the nett weight of the bale will be 219 lbs. The cantar of cotton is 100 rottoli. Mc'Culloch, speaking of the great increase in the growth and exportation of Egyptian cotton, says:—"We doubt, however, whether the encouragement given to the culture of cotton has not been really injurious to Egypt."

* Under the Ptolemies the population of Alexandria is believed to have been 300,000. When I first visited it, in 1825, it was not much above 20,000.

In 1860, when I last visited Egypt, the population was supposed to average about 80,000, but it varies considerably at different seasons, and according to Mc'Culloch (see new edition of "Commercial Dictionary," published in 1859; p. 15), when greatest it is supposed to exceed 100,000.

Mc'Culloch says that cotton has been grown in Egypt from a remote period, but of a very inferior quality, short stapled, and closely resembling "surats." But in 1820 Monsieur Jumel accidentally found a valuable variety of long stapled cotton, grown in the garden of Mahe Bey, at Cairo, raised from seeds growing in Dougala and Senaar. On Jumel reporting of the superiority of this cotton to the Pacha Mohammed Ali, the cultivation of it was immediately undertaken in a large scale, and for a long time this Mahe, or Makko, cotton has been the principal export from Egypt. The quantity of cotton exported in 1858, according to Mc'Culloch, was 579,537 cantars. The value, in Egyptian piastres, 109,102,700.

The total value of Egyptian products exported he estimates at 301,844,582 piastres.*

The Red Sea is a long narrow channel beset with coral reefs, with regular alternating succession of monsoon winds prevailing, especially at the entrance of the straits of Bab-el-Mandel calculated at particular periods, and for lengthened ones too, to obstruct navigation and prolong voyages, that, with favorable winds might be made in seven or eight days, to periods of thirty-six days and upwards in the case of sailing vessels. The extreme length of this sea is 560 leagues (upwards of 1,500 miles), and the average breadth from 25 to 30 leagues, the greatest width not exceeding 150 miles. But the Red Sea, long before the application of steam to navigation was certainly used extensively by sailing vessels of different nations, for in 1774 we find that the East India Company solicited the Turkish government that the Red Sea should be closed against all European vessels excepting their own, *and that moderate* request was granted by the Porte.

Ergo—M. St. Hilaire, in his essay on the Maritime Canal project, concludes that the Red Sea was then deemed sufficiently navigable for European sailing vessels. But in 1779 a pious Sultan, lamenting the concession of the Red Sea to the Giaours

* The exchange with England is generally about 100 piastres to £1 sterling.

of any nation, issued a Hatti-Sheriffe in revocation of the above mentioned concession, declaratory of his intention of reserving the Red Sea for the Holy Pilgrimage to Mecca, and prohibiting it to all European vessels, including those of England.*

M. de Lesseps, having written to a superior officer of the French navy, who had just been engaged in exploring the Red Sea, for his opinion on the difficulties of navigating that expanse of water, has received an answer from which we select the following passages :—

"About fifteen years ago, if I am not mistaken, the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, having secured a harbour of refuge, and established a coal depôt at Aden, began its service between Suez and the East Indies. From one departure per month, the Company has gradually arrived at a weekly departure. Eight times a month, forty-eight times a year, large screw or paddle-wheel steamers, with a draught of water varying from 18 to 21 feet, as much as our largest frigates, run up and down the Red Sea regardless of weather and trade-winds, and yet during the whole time only one vessel, the *Alma*, has been lost, and the causes of that disaster are still but very imperfectly known. If these results are highly honourable to the captains employed by the Company, it must also be admitted that they are not very unfavourable to the character of the Red Sea. Are we to say then, that no dangers exist in the Red Sea? Certainly not. Throughout its whole length, and on both shores, there are many rocks both above and below the surface, which call for the most vigilant watchfulness on the part of all who navigate it, and cause captains many a sleepless night and wearisome watches to the crews ; but are not such the inevitable duties of a seafaring life? . . . . . The Red Sea is little affected by the tides. The currents obey the prevailing winds, which blow almost regularly and in zones, generally from the north between Suez and Djeddah, are variable in the middle region, and are mostly from the south in

* Reply of M. B. St. Hilaire, member of the Institution of France, to the Edinburgh Review. Lon. 1856.

the neighbourhood of the straits of Bab-el-Mandel. Sailing vessels will have carefully to note the seasons which modify either way these general but not absolute directions of the wind in order to avoid the long detentions; but contrary winds can hardly be called dangers."

The situation of Suez, in a commercial point of view, is excellent, lying nearly at the extremity of the Arabian Gulph; it is only three days' journey from Cairo, five and a half from Damietta, eight from Hebron, the modern *Kalyb*, ten days from Jerusalem, two days and a half from the *Haman Pharoon*, and five from Sinai.

On the occasion of a visit of mine to Suez, of which an account has been published, one of my first objects was to ascertain if the sea was fordable, opposite the town, at eb-tide; the Consular agent and the Levantine writers of the Governor assured me that it was not, but I attached little importance to their assertions. I therefore desired my servant to find me an Indian sailor, who wished to earn a dollar, by crossing the gulf. In the evening, a man made his appearance, who offered to make the attempt. I explained to him the nature of the object I wanted to ascertain. I directed him to walk straight across, as far as it was possible to do so, and to hold his hands over his head as he walked along. He was in the water forthwith; he proceeded slowly and steadily, his hands above his head; and in nine minutes he was at the other side of the Red Sea. On his return, he told me what I knew to be a fact, that he had walked every step across, the deepest part being about the middle of the gulf, when the water was up to his chin. I proceeded now to follow his course; I gave him another dollar to cross over before me, and as I was nearly eight inches taller than my guide, where his chin was in the water, my long beard was quite dry.

The tide was now coming in fast, and by the time we reached the middle of the sea, the Indian thought it imprudent to proceed further, as I could not boast of being an expert swimmer. Had we remained ten minutes longer, we should inevitably

have suffered Pharoah's fate, for the opposite bank was perceptibly diminishing, and at ten o'clock, the sea, which was hardly more than the breadth of the Thames at London Bridge, two hours before, was now from two to three miles broad. I returned perfectly convinced that the Red Sea, opposite Suez, is passable at ebb-tide.

By a mark which I made on a perpendicular rock on the seaside, about eighty paces from the spot we forded, I found the difference between the ebb and flow, to be six feet two inches. The fountains of *Moses*, above *El Naba*, are about seven miles from Suez, by water, but by land the distance is double.

Five miles to the north of Suez, the sea terminates in a narrow creek and saline marsh, which it is necessary to wind round in going by land to *El Naba*. Niebuhr says he walked across this creek at ebb-tide, and was only knee deep in water. The Bedouins do this daily, but I am not aware that any European before me ever attempted the passage of the sea opposite Suez: indeed, the very inhabitants considered it impracticable, till I proved the contrary.*

The *Times* correspondent writes from Alexandria, Nov. 20th, 1860:—

"When M. de Lesseps first started his scheme for uniting the waters of the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, the subject was received and discussed with intense interest by the European public in Egypt. The thing had been presented in a form to strike the imagination; curiosity was felt in respect to the political views that might be taken of it by different nations, and, in addition to these, another cause operated in the matter. The Russian war had just then opened out an era of great prosperity to the country. All descriptions of produce, goods and property were daily rising in value, every one was growing rich and with the influx of money there was springing up a spirit of speculation, than which none could be better calculated to

* Madden's Travels in the East, vol. 2, p. 208.

insure an eager welcome to this, or, indeed to any scheme that might have presented itself. An immense number of shares were accordingly immediately taken up; but alas! before long a total change had come over the formerly flourishing state of affairs, and when M. de Lesseps made his first demand for something more substantial than sympathising speeches and fine words, his Egyptian friends, one and all, closely buttoned up their pockets, and what is more, accompanied their refusal with some very hard remarks about their being called upon to pay down their money, when, as they asserted, the most essential conditions under which it had been subscribed were altogether unfulfilled. M. de Lesseps unfortunately lost his temper, and roundly charged the Alexandrians with being a set of unworthy gambling speculators, with whom sordid motives of gain outweighed all the higher and nobler aspirations with which his shareholders ought to be actuated. This of course did not mend matters, and down to the present day, I believe no shares whatever are held in Egypt, always excepting, of course, that unfortunate moiety of the capital which ill-luck or whatever it may be, has fastened on the broad shoulders of the Government or the Viceroy. I have been led into this retrospect by the singular contrast afforded between the intense eagerness with which the subject and everything connected with it was at one time discussed, and the cold indifference with which it is now treated. In fact it is this state of general unconcern which I must plead as the chief excuse for my inability to give you any precise information as to how things are progressing at the so-called Port Said, or at the more inland stations of the Suez desert. These places are so much out of the ordinary tracks of communication that, in as far as regards the obtaining of information from independent witnesses, they might as well be in the interior of Tartary, or on the shores of the Victoria Nyanza. It is true a few French officials of the company, superintendents, and others, come and go at frequent intervals, but these people have got into the way of looking upon it as a matter of course that everything pro-

ceeding from these sources must be taken *cum grano salis*; and in point of fact, such a spoonful of the condiment is added, that its saline flavour overpowers all else, and the only result produced is a general impression that a more or less free expenditure of money is going on, with very little real or tangible effect. I can, however, speak with more precision of the operations carried on at the quarries of Meks, which lie close in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and whence, we are informed, the stone is to be procured for building the immense jetties and harbour of Port Said. The road from the town leads to the westward, along the sea shore, towards the Fort of the Marabout. The coast and approaches to Alexandria are here strongly defended by lines of batteries and detached forts, most of which, I believe, are now unarmed: and lastly, with a deep ditch and earthworks running at a right angle from the sea towards Lake Mareotis. Immediately beyond this is a quarry given by the Viceroy to the Suez Canal Company. A stone jetty, with tramways, has been run out a short way into the sea, and a little further west another has been commenced. The two, I am informed, are at their extremities to be deflected towards each other, so as to form an enclosed harbour, within which it will be possible to load the stone-barges in all weathers. A piece of rising ground, sloping gently upwards towards the rear, marks the site of the quarry. It has been opened up in two places, in each of which a steam crane at intervals lazily lifts a block of stone into a truck. Scattered about, in the quays on the piers, when I visited the place a couple of days ago, there were some twenty Arab labourers intermixed with some half dozen Europeans, by whom the work seems to be carried on in a slow and easy sort of way, very different from the active and bustling mode of working I had been led to expect.

In Dec., 1860, the Viceroy of Egypt made a journey to Suez, where he remained some days examining *the preparations for* the intended works connected with the great undertaking of the Suez Canal.

The *Times* correspondent, in a letter from Alexandria, dated December 17th, says:—

"Since Said Pasha's return from Suez, intelligence has been received of certain disturbances having lately arisen with the Bedouins of the neighbouring deserts. It was at first stated that they had interfered with the work people engaged in laying the foundations of the Red Sea lighthouses; but, according to later and more reliable reports, the affray has solely been between a small number of Bedouins, recruited as labourers by M. de Lesseps for his canal works, and a small detachment of Egyptian irregular troops. The Egptian Government, it appears, objects to the introduction of Bedouin Arabs into the Isthmus, and in the endeavour to prevent the enrolment, by the opposition of its influence among the Bedouins, a quarrel has taken place in which one or two men have lost their lives. It is difficult to understand what the precise objections of the Egyptian Government to the enrolment of the Bedouins may be; but even to those least favourable to the prosecution of M. de Lessep's scheme, it will be a matter of regret that, if good and solid grounds exist for the prohibition, they should not be set forth in an open and unassailable manner. M. de Lesseps went to Suez for the declared purpose of engaging labourers for the canal works, and of imparting a fresh impulse to the progress of the company's operations. As might easily be foreseen, his efforts in that direction met with but very slender success. Whether with or without the approval of the Government, he has little chance of collecting more than a trifling number of Bedouins, and still less of being able to keep them at work for any length of time. Even their love of money will never be sufficient to overcome their innate dislike for labour of any kind, and they will moreover encounter the same causes for discontent as those that have acted in the case of the Egyptian fellahs.

"These people are industrious and laborious to the highest degree, in spite of which the attempts to secure their services have proved altogether ineffectual, as was, indeed, clearly foretold by

all possessing the slightest knowledge of their temper and character. The small number allured by the prospect of high pay soon grow dissatisfied, and endeavour, by every means in their power to obtain their discharge. Attempts have been made to maintain discipline by flogging, a thing which will lead to serious consequences if attempted with Bedouins. In the case of the fellahs, the immediate result has been that the men desert in bodies, sacrificing the arrears of pay that are held back in the endeavour to bind them to their work. Not only, however, is this the case with the native labourers, but even the European artisans have been throwing up their appointments in large numbers. One, a Frenchman, when lately asked why he had abandoned his place, answered that at first he got men but no pickaxes, then he was supplied with pickaxes but no men, and at last, when he had both labourers and tools, they found themselves without stores or provision of any kind, upon which he and his men appear to have left the place in a body. The only work that can, though by a stretch of language, be characterised as in the least degree effective, is performed by the dredging machines, a small number of which are at work in Lake Menzaleh, and one at an inner station, whither it has been conveyed with heavy expense of labour and time. These machines, it had been announced, would excavate 1,800 cubic metres per day, instead of which the *maximum* of their work proves to be only 200 cubic metres each. At Port Said, the tramway constructed for the purpose of conveying materials to the jetty, and which last spring was destroyed by the sea, has not been repaired. Some of the inland stations have been altogether abandoned. At one the few men that remain are employed in collecting natives, for what useful purpose in connection with the canal it is hard to understand. At another the men have been engaged in cutting a section of the grand canal on its full scale, the object of which seems equally, if not more mysterious, since even the elementary cutting cannot be said to have been anywhere fairly commenced. M. de Lesseps late applied to the Viceroy for assistance in ob-

taining work-people—in other words, to be supplied with forced labour—a request which Said Pacha has refused the French Government. The latter for the present appear inclined to leave M. de Lesseps to his own resources. If this policy of "non-intervention" be persisted in, the affairs of the Canal Company will probably soon come to an issue, and, for the sake of the shareholders, it may be added, the sooner the better."

The *Times*, of the 27th of December, 1860, thus ridicules the project of "the Suez Canal." Will our friends on the other side of the Strait forgive us if we remind them of a subject on which we were talking with considerable vehemence some few months ago? Pray, how is the Isthmus of the Suez Canal getting on? We are impatient for the performance of those magnificent promises. We are waiting anxiously to sail through that bit of desert which cuts us off from the East and sends us down across the equator and round the Stormy Cape. We heard, not long ago, that it was the destiny of France to confer this great benefit upon the world; and we heard her insist that she would force it down the throat of perfidious Albion, reluctant even as perfidious Albion might be to receive it, and anxious as perfidious Albion might be to prevent others from rejoicing in it. The fruits of this great achievement to be achieved were to be enjoyed by us and others in our own despite, and we were to confess by about this time the superior civilization and enterprise of France. Now, we hope our excellent ally has not been defrauding the world of a great deal of very sparkling admiration, to say nothing of the mere dross which lay at the bottom. We hope she has not been discounting the performance of this engineering miracle, and fancying that the work has been completed, and that there is no further need of any exertion. We want to sail through the Isthmus of Suez. M. de Lesseps and the whole French press have promised us, not always in the most flattering language, that we should do so. We put aside the wording of the promise and regard only its purport; and here we are with good, sound ships, well laden, ready to pass through, and to pay any reasonable toll for

liberty to do so. It will not do to say, "You never gave us any money." That was no condition to the promise. We are ready to pay you toll. We never intended to sink money in that particular quicksand, and we always protested that we never would spend money on such a scheme. But, although we will not advance sixpence, we are quite ready to enjoy all the benefits of success. Solomon was the wisest of men; and when Solomon sent his ships that had been built on the shore of the Red Sea to Ophir (or Africa) for gold and ivory, he very probably sent them through the old Suez Canal; but we never heard that Solomon had anything to do with the making of that Canal. If he had, in all probability his name would not have come down to us as that of the wisest of men, and he would not have died so rich as he did. We emulate Solomon. We propose to use this canal, and not to make it. Of course, we are a mere nation of shopkeepers, and we take the sordid point of view; but M. de Lesseps is of Imperial connexion, and leads a generous people to the van of civilization. France and M. de Lesseps will never go back from their united word, and baulk us of the boon they promised us, or meanly tell us that they had meant that we should buy it. We feel that we have as much right to enquire from time to time how our Suez Ship Canal is going on, as well as a borough alderman, or a churchwarden, or a tax collector to whom a service of plate has been voted by an admiring circle, has to go into Hunt and Roskell's from time to time, and see how his cream-jug and tea-pot go on. France has voted to us, and subscribed for us, and promised us a canal for our ships. Scarcely anyone, besides us, has any ships trading to India and the East, and we are naturally anxious to know how our *cadeau* progresses. The news we publish from Egypt is very disheartening. According to our correspondent's account, there is as little doing in the way of resuming the work of Pharoah Necho, as though M. de Lesseps had never been born, and Suez canal shares had never been taken upon the Bourse at Paris, or proffered upon the Stock Exchange in London. Ever and anon,

it seems, important-looking official personages go forth into the Desert, perhaps to bear away the most pressing sins of the directors; but it is not yet apparent that all the expenditure has hitherto effected even the easy process of making a channel through the sand. It is not certain that M. de Lesseps, with all his millions, has up to this time cleared as much sand away as Mr. Davis with a few Arabs and a few hundreds of pounds, and a few months' time, cleared away from the mounds of Carthage. Now, the difficulty of this Suez Canal is like the difficulty of rearing a poor man's child—it lies chiefly in the mouth. There is no difficulty in making the canal; the difficulty is in filling it and keeping it filled. Scarcely any preparation has been made towards providing for the mouth. They have run out two little jetties into the sea near the spot where the stone lies, which is to be used to make a stone basin for that part of the Mediterranean into which the too generous Nile is ever pouring its embarrassing superfluity of soil banks. But this preparation has, as we understand, nothing to do with the canal, but is only to form a harbour for the transports which are to convey the stone which is to be an item in the construction of the canal; it has about the same relation to the completion of the canal which the arrival of Joseph in Egypt had to the completion of the Pyramids."

But whatever may be the result of the undertaking to connect the Red Sea with the Mediterranean, it is impossible to overlook, and it would be unworthy of an enlightened man of any nation to depreciate the magnitude of the enterprize, and the vastness of the service it would render to mankind were it accomplished. It would do more for the different nations and peoples of the East than ever we accomplished for them by our International Commission in Syria, or our battles of diplomacy in Constantinople, or campaigns in the Crimea, in fruitless efforts to sustain and preserve the tottering power of the Turkish Empire. And, be it remembered, the man who originated and attempted to accomplish this gigantic work, has laboured at it with signal courage and perseverance, and abilities of no common

order, for seven years, and that amidst enormous difficulties, discouragement, and impediments thrown in his way at the Porte, as well as at the Court of the Viceroy of Egypt, he is still labouring for the attainment of his mighty object, and contending manfully with adverse influences on all sides. I am quite sure his efforts will be unavailing, not because the engineering difficulties connected with the undertaking, great as they are, must be considered insuperable, but because the financial difficulties connected with it are so, the projector being a Frenchman, and action being brought to bear on his transactions in the principal European money markets, that may have its origin in political jealousies and misgivings—perhaps groundless misapprehensions—and in adverse railway competition on the part of projectors of Egyptian and Turkish railway lines.

M. de Lesseps' vast project, and the result I fear for it, are destined, in all probability, to illustrate an aphorism of our great moralist and magniloquent sentence-maker:—"Great enterprizes are always laudable even when they are beyond the strength that undertakes them." But there would be no harm in qualifying a little this piece of proverbial wisdom by adding —when the means that are expended on it are the projector's own, or the probability of success is so great as to warrant speculation attended with some risk to others.

END OF APPENDIX.

INDEX.

Abdallah Maimun, first founder of secret societies in the heart of Islamism, 2, 178.

Abdul Medjid, Sultan, succeeds his father Mahmoud II., the 2nd July, 1839; notice of his career; amiable character, and natural disposition; feeble temperament; early exhaustion of his vital and mental energies attributed by Dr. Openheim to drugs administered to him with a view to rendering him imbecile, 1, 439, 449; remarkable proceeding in relation to a fresco picture of the Virgin and an altar; a portrait of a Greek Emperor discovered in the mosque of San Sophia, 1, 449; Abdul Medjid's charter of Reform; the Hatti Sheriffe of Gulhaneh proclaimed in 1840, and its embodiment in the Tanzimat, 1, 450, 458; his death; notice of his career, 2, 387.

Abdul Azis, present Sultan; singular instance of his fanaticism, 2, 273; his accession to the throne, notice of his fanaticism and encouragement of the promoters of the Syrian massacres, 2, 393; the present Sultan, previously to the death of his predecessor, the head of the fanatic party of Constantinople; alleged complicity with the recent massacres in Syria, 2, 271.

Abou Beker, first caliph after Mahommed, his wars and slaughters of Christians in Syria; capture of Damascus; his death, 632, A.D., 1, 128, 133.

Advocates of Turkish institutions, 1, 2.

Adversaries of Christian principles, 1, 2.

"Advanced thinkers" in England tolerant of Turkish antagonism to Christians, 1, 4.

Alexandria taken by Amron, lieutenant of Caliph Omar; destruction of famous library, 1, 138, 145.

Alexandria, Emperor of Russia, "a Greek of the lower empire," his axiom "Russia must have the key of her own house," Constantinople being deemed the key to Russia, 2, 257.

Ali, son-in-law and cousin of Mohammed Fourth Calliph; cabals and contests at his election; war against him waged by Ayesha; Moawiyah sends an army against him from Syria; assassinations of the Calliph Ali, A.D. 661, 1, 155, 177; elections of the remarkable sentences of Ali, 1, 184, 187; tomb and place of pilgrimage, described by Loftus, 1, 471.

Ali Bey, conqueror of Mecca, his raids in Syria 2, 243.

Alison, Sir A., opinion of the evils of Turkish rule, 2, 406.

Amurath I., third Ottoman Sultan, notice of his career, 1, 256; entered on the mission of the Ottoman sovereigns at the beginning of his reign by warfare with the Christians; crossed the Hellespont with a numerous army intended for the capture of Constantinople, and fixed his head-quarters in Galipoli in 1360, A.D., 1, 257; massacre of young Greek nobles on the banks of the river Marizza, 1, 263; decisive victory over the Confederate Christian Sclavonic Powers in 1389, 1, 265; put his son Saoud to death, 1, 268; assassination of the Sultan by the hand of a Servian nobleman, 1, 267.

Ansayrii, of Syria, religion and peculiarities; Walpole's account of; account of in an Arab geography lately printed at Beyrout by the American missionaries; Rev. Mr. Lyde's account of their religion, 2, 195, 208.

Andronicus, son of the Greek Emperor Paleologus; his terrible fate, 1, 263.

Arabs of Syria, different tribes and races, 2, 12, 13.

Armenia, Ancient, notice of its people and religion; its language; the alphabet of, invented by Stalescop, A.D., 406, 1, 212, 215.

Armenians, persecutions of for embracing Protestantism, 2, 38, 39; origin, language; introduction of Christianity 260 A.D.; like the Jews they preserve a distinct national and religious existence; cession of a large portion of their territory to Russia in 1827; numbers in Ottoman Empire, 2, 117, 121; community of, in the Turkish Empire, notice of, 2, 117, 132; their church; origin of its schism and separation from Church of Rome in 6th century; chief points at variance; persecutions; violent controversies relative to election of Primate in 1845, 2, 133, 152; notice of those

in communion with the Church of Rome in the Turkish empire, 2, 133, 152.
Assassins, secret order of; their early history and organization in the time of the caliphs, 1, 194, 204; derivation from them of the existing secret sects of Syria; J. Von Hammer's history of, 2, 162, 194; origin and organization of their order; their hostility to the caliphs; their reply to the envoy of Sultan Sandiar as to their doctrine; their destruction by Hulaku the lieutenant of Mangu Khan; secret sects supposed to be derived from, 2, 176, 195.
Athos Mount; account of the monasteries in its district, 2, 81, 84.
Attila, "the scourge of God;" his career of conquest, rapacity, destruction in the Roman Provinces in Asia Minor, and from the Black Sea to the Gulf of Venice, in France and Italy; stayed in the vicinity of Rome by the great St. Leo in its course of blood and fire; end of his career, 1, 225, 226.
Author, statement of subjects treated in both volumes of work, 1, 22; his experience of the utter failure of Protestant missionaries to convert the Moslems, 2, 31; his practical experience of the mode of supplying Armenian Church with clergy, 2, 126; at Jerusalem when news of battle of Navarino arrived; departure from and arrival in Egypt, 2, 144; his first visit to the East in 1824 and object of it, 2, 263; experience of dire results of Turkish rule in Asia Minor, 2, 403.
Austria, base conduct of, in the case of the Greek patriot Rhigas, a refugee in the Austrian dominions delivered up to the Turkish Government and put to death; uniform baseness of Austrian policy in the East, 2, 261, 262.
Ayesha, the prophets, favourite wife, account of, 1, 54.
Ayesha, widow of the prophet; her occupation; causing rebellion, mutinies, and massacres, and intrigues against Ali, son-in-law of Mohammed, 1, 151, 156, 158.

Bajazet Sultan, notice of his career, 1, 268; fratricidal imperial policy; murder of his brother Yacoub; justification on Koran principles, by "Turkish History," 1, 269; first Ottoman ruler took the title of Sultan, ib,; his brutal character, 1, 270; at the pinnacle of Ottoman greatness in 1402, A.D., when Timour, the Tartar, invaded his dominions, after having overrun a great portion of the globe; defeated the Turkish Sultan and took the latter prisoner; question of his imprisonment in an iron cage; death of Bajazet, 1, 284, 287.
Beyrout, account of, 2, 5.
Blanqui, Mons., his view of the Turkish charter of toleration; the Hatti-Sheriffe of Gul-Haneh—"an atrocious deception," 2, 281.
Borè, de Mons., results of protestant and catholic missions, in the East, compared, 2, 41.
Bulgarians, alleged movement of thousands of their race, their separation from the Orthodox Greek Church, and junction with the Latin Church, 2, 22.
Bulwer, Sir H., his detailed statement of Turkish finances, 2, 401.
Buddhism, numbers of followers throughout the world, 2 appendix.

Caliphate, notice of; an account of religion of the Saracens, previous to and after Mohammed, 1, 116, 194.
Candia, evil results there of Turkish rule, 2, 404.
Canning, Sir Stratford, remonstrance with Sultan against execution of Ovaghian, a young Armenian, for the exercise of religious right; succeeds in obtaining abrogation of the law Ovaghian executed; and consequent European intervention in affairs of the Turkish Empire, 2, 131, 132.
Causcasus, one of its remarkable tribes—the Ossites, 1, 216.
Chaldeans, number in union with Church of Rome; their origin, language, &c., 2, 26, 27.
Chasseaud, his observations on the Egyptian occupation of Syria, and the part taken by the Druses in relation to it; his remarkable account of religion of Druses, 2, 226.
Church and State connexions, evils of 2, 86.
Churchill, Colonel, letter on futile measures of international commission in relation to Syrian massacres, 2, 361.
Clement, his election as metropolitian of the Russian Church, 1197; the cause of a religious war which lasted a century, 2, 58.
Constantinople, capture of, by Sultan Mohammed 2nd, in 1453, A.D.; doom of the Christian Rayahs of the Turkish Empire, and consequences of the overthrow of Greek Empire, 1, 290; formulas of capitulations, those of people of Jerusalem to the Caliph Omaz, and of inhabitants of people of Constantinople to Sultan Mohammed the 2nd, 1, 290, 298; capture of; population of, at time of capture; estimates of the slain; one of the Turkish conqueror's first acts after the capture of the city; riding into the church of St. Sophia; his next visit to the palace of the slain Emperor Constantine the 9th; his sentimental repetition of the lines of Ferdousi; in that palace issues his infamous orders to seize on a child of the Grand Duke Nicholas Notaras, and subsequent orders to put Notaras and his whole family to death, 1, 289, 299; different Christian sects of, 2, 19, 20.
Consuls in Syria, the legitimate duties of; subordinated to polemical obligations to missionary institutions, 2, 268; proposal of the author of a recent French treatise on Syrian affairs, to dismember Turkey and make Constantinople the seat of the pontifical government, 2, 415.
Consuls in Syria, proceedings of, in 1860, 2, 349.
Creasy, Professor, his history of Turkish Empire, 1, 10.
Crusade, new, in 1396; its lamentable results, and massacre by Sultan Bajazet of the principal Christian leaders, 1, 271.
Crusade, fatal battle for the Christians at Nicopolis, in 1396, A.D., 1, 273.
Crusades, Gibbon's sentiments in relation to, 1, 258; question of legitimacy, justice, and necessity of war, ib.; crusade instituted against the Turks on behalf of the Christians of Hungary, and its results, in 1376, ib. Dates of different crusades, 2, appendix.
Cyprus, dire results of Turkish rule there, 2, 404.

Daher, Sheik, governor of St. Jean d'Acre, his career and its termination, 2, 242, 247.
Damascus; execution of Achmed Pacha, Osman Bey, Ali Bey, and Mustapha Bey, 2, 342; evidence of the horrors of the massacre at

Damascus and Deir-el-Kammar, ten weeks after their occurrence described by a correspondent of a London journal, 2, 344.
Dervishes; ministers and agents of Turkish fanaticism; the part taken by them at the commencement of the massacres in the Lebanon, 2, 273; notice of origin and vicissitudes of their order; their mysticism and fanaticism; their intimate connexion with the Janissaries; their agency in the Turkish provinces in all conspiracies against Christian Rayahs, concocted in Constantinople, 1, 319, 334.
Diabekr, dire results of Turkish rule there, 2, 405.
Djezzar, Pacha, notice of, 2, 245.
Druses; alleged derivation of origin from Assassins of Syria of olden time; doctrines, observances, and prejudices same as the Ansayrii, 2, 162; looked upon as the representatives in Syria of the Ismalian sect of the followers of Ali, from whom the Assassins are derived, 2, 196; notice of their history; origin attributed to the Saracens who settled in Syria during a term of 300 years, and their religion said to be derived from the Karmatians, one of the earliest sects of Mohammedanism; massacre of Druses by Ansayrii, in 1811, 2, 210, 212; historical notice of the government of the Druses; anecdotes of those who held the reins of government from 1651 to 1845, 2, 213; Chasseaud's observations on the part taken by them on the Egyptian occupation of Syria, 2, 220; Lord Lindsay's account of, in "Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land," in 1836, 2, 224, 234; their towns and villages, 2, 225, 226; their religious rites and practices, detailed from an original Druse document, 2, 226, 233; what is to be done with the Druses? what has been done with them to secure the Christians from their fanaticism, 2, 233; their perfidious conduct in the wars of Sheik Daher and Djezzar Pacha, 2, 246; massacres of Christians in 1860, detailed account of, 2, 281, 368; detailed account of their frightful murders and savagery on the Maronites in 1860, 2, 305, 368; "gentleman," a graphic sketch of, in "The Times," 2, 336; general views of their atrocities against the Syrian Christians in 1860, 2, 351.

Easthope, Lady, a strenuous defender and eulogist of Turkish institutions, 1, 10.
Egypt, brief notice of its early history and vicissitudes, 1, 308; English expedition against, in 1807, 1, 364; first visit of the author to Egypt, in 1824, second in 1840, and third in 1860. striking changes in population of Alexandria, and produce of the soil in those intervals, 1, 391; notice of career of Mohammed Ali; his wars with the Mamelukes, and ultimate massacre of their chiefs, 1, 403, 411; in 1814 Mohammed Ali issued a decree declaring himself sole possessor of all the soil of Egypt; his war in Syria; statistics of Egypt; finances, population, &c., 1, 411, 420.
England, support given to the Greek cause honourable to her character, that support being unselfishly unsectarian as well as unprecedented, 2, 265.
English policy in regard to Turkey; Pitt's idea of the balance of power, and the necessity of opposing Russian views in Turkey, and maintaining that empire; expedition to Egypt, 1; 355, 364.
Ertogrul, father of Othman, first sovereign of the Turkish empire, notice of, 1, 243.
Eton's opinion of the rapacious and aggressive government of Turkey, 1, 15.
Eutychians, the Doctrine of, 2, 253.

Fanaticism, the permanent dark shadow of it over the Turkish empire, described by Dr, Newman, 1, 473.
Fanaticism, its existence at the present time throughout the Turkish empire; the present Sultan its active protector and defender previous to his accession to the throne, 2, 267, 270.
Finances, Turkish, latest and most reliable statement of, by Sir Henry Bulwer, 2, 401. latest official statement of, communicated to Lord Russell, Aug, 1860, 2, 491.
Fratricidal policy of, the Turkish Sultans at various periods, 1, 371, 422.

Gibbon, his account of the capture of Constantinople; his antipathy to Christianity; want of sympathy for the sufferings of the Greek Christians at the hands of Turks, 1, 291.
Graham, Mr., his report to Lord Dufferin on the Syrian massacres, to 18th July, 1860, 2, 313,
Greece; insurrection in Epirus in 1853, after signal successes against the Turks, denounced by the allied French and English governments, and indirect measures taken for its suppression, 1, 511; her various attempts at revolution; her ultimate success in 1821, 2, 260.
Greeks, number in European Turkey, Syria, and Asia Minor, 2, 64, 66; secular clergy of the orthodox church notice of, 2, 71, 80; monks and monasteries of the Greek Church, 2, 80, 86.
Greek Church, divided into three distinct communions; schism between it and Latin Church; organization of, at downfall of Constantinople, and of Greek Empire, 2, 51, 52, 54, 55; its separation from Latin Church; number of persons belonging to it, 2, 63, 64; clergy of; revenues of patriarch and bishops; constant recurrence of genuflexions in its religious ceremonies, especially in monasteries; frequency and rigour of fasts; its constitution, 2, 67, 71, 77.
Greek Orthodox Church, its history and constitution, both in Russia and Turkey, 2, 51, 62.
Greek and Latin Churches, separation of, 2, 63, 65; strength and status of the Greek community in European Turkey, 2, 66, 70; proposed re-union; efforts of the present Pontiff for that object, and their results, 2, 87, 116; proposed re-union; reply of Orthodox Eastern Church to encyclical letter of Pius IX., in 1848; a document which may be considered an exposition of the Greek Orthodox doctrine, 2, 91, 115.
Guilleminot, Count, French ambassador at the Porte; protects the members of the Roman Catholic Church in Ottoman dominions, 1829, 2, 144.
Gurowski, Count, his work on Russia and its policy in the East, 2, 411.

Hakem, the third of the Fatimite caliphs, assumes a divine character; his persecutions; his reign a wild mixture of vice and folly, 2, 170.
Hammer, Von, observations on Turkish his-

tory, 1, 10; hyperbolical eulogies of the Koran, 1, 59; his history of the Assassins, the only detailed authentic account, 2, 166.
Hassan, son of Ali, fifth caliph after Mohammed resigned the caliphate to Moawiyah after having reigned about six months, retired to Medina, and died of poison administered by one of his wives, 661, A.D., 1, 188, 192.
Hassan Sabah, founder of a new branch of the sect of Seveners, his extraordinary career, 2, 172, 179; fate of his relatives, 2, 180.
Hassoun, Monsignore, appointed by the Vatican to be primate of Constantinople, 1845; displeasure of the national church at his appointment, 2, 148.
Heraclius, the Greek Emperor, his wars with Persia; his introduction into his dominions of Turcoman tribes as auxiliaries, 1, 209.
Holy places in Syria; cause of the Crimean war; various controversies preceding it, and claims of different powers to a protectorate over Christians of several denominations, 1, 482, 498.

Ibrahim Pacha, invasion of Syria in 1831; opinion of Europe, 2, 44, 45, 46; his unsuccessful attempts to subdue the Druses during three campaigns, 2, 220; remarkable incident evincing his cruel despotism, 2, 221.
Imposture in religion, and impostors who become fanatics considered in relation to the Koran, and its author, 1, 72.
Imperial pride, its hostilities to truth in eminently prosperous nations, 1, 71.
Introductory chapter of Turkish institutions, 1, 1.
Ionian Islands, origin of the English protectorate, 1, 395, 360 measures taken by the English government against the insurgents of Epirus in arms against the Turks, in 1853, 1, 512.
Islamism, different sects which sprung from, 2, 166, 169.

Janissary institution, its brutal characteristics in the time of the Sultan Bajazet, 1, 270.
Janissaries, the, notice of origin, progress, and end in 1826, 1, 334, 352; their excesses in Servia in 1807, 1, 361; notice of their career, 1, 356, 358, 426; their massacre in June, 1826, 1, 428.
Jeremiah II., Patriarch of Constantinople, declines proposal of Czar Theodore to set up his patriarchal throne in city of Vladimir, and thereby establish a Russian patriarchate independent altogether of Greek patriarchate, 2, 59.
Jesuits, missionary establishments in Turkish Empire, 2, 21.
Jerusalem, terms of capitulation accorded by Caliph Omar, 1, 295.
Jews, notice of this community in the Turkish empire, 2, 27, 28, 29, 30.
Job, Archbishop of Rostoff, raised to Primacy of Moscow and all Russia, 1582, from which annals of Russian Patriarchs date, 2, 58.
Jordan River, Mr. Stanley's notice of, 2, 10, 11.
Karmatians, Sale's account of their origin, and supposed founder, Karmata, 2, 164.
Kieff, ancient capital of Russia and cradle of Muscovite Christianity; cathedral erected in, by Prince Vladimir; its destruction by the Moguls in 1240, 2, 55, 57, 58.
Koran, the, its Christian apologists and eulogists, 1, 5; its true character; the organised fanaticism of Mohammedanism, 1, 6; its great doctrine; war against Christianity; death to the enemy who will not be converted and embrace the law of Islam; exposition of it by Ubicini, 1, 7; extracts from, illustrative of its tenets and teaching, 1, 58; English eulogists and admirers of; Sale, Lane, &c., extolled by Walpole, 1, 59, 64, 70; doubts of the authenticity of, as a genuine production of Mohammed and his scribes, 1, 68; passages from several chapters, 1, 76, 111; appealed to by the Mufti, Ali Bestami; after a solemn capitulation was entered into with the King of Bosnia by Sultan Mohammed the 2nd, and interpreted by that functionary for a justification of a violation of a capitulation, entered into with unbelievers, and putting to death the Christian king and his two sons, who had surrendered to the Sultan, 1, 300; similar decisions of the Mufti, justifying, on religious grounds, the projected massacre of the Christians, on the part of Sultan Selim the 1st, 1, 302; project for the extermination of the Christians, on religious grounds, discussed in the divan in the reign of Amurath the 4th in 1770 A.D., 1, 303; similar project agitated in the divan in the reign of Mustapha the 3rd 1, 303; similar project meditated by Sultan Mahmoud 2nd in 1821, A.D., and account of the insurrections in Greece and Moldavia, 1, 303; his orders for the executions of the patriarch of, Constantinople, and four Greek archbishops, 1, 304; Sultan Mahmoud's, meditated extermination of the Christian Rayahs, on the news reaching Constantinople of the defeat of the Turks and destruction of their fleet at Navarino in 1828, 1, 304.
Kourscheed, Pacha, his infamous conduct in the affairs of Syria in 1861, 2, 288; lets loose the Bashi Bazouk soldiers on the Maronites, 2, 290, 292.

Lacordaire, views of Turkish Empire, 1, 21.
Latins, their condition in Turkey; jealousy of other Rayahs, Christian and Jewish on account of their prosperity, 2, 20, 21; their various religious estab ishments in the Levant 2, 221.
Latin Church, its separation from Greek Church 2, 63.
Lenormant, Mons., his account of the massacres he witnessed in Syria in 1860, 2, 285.
Lindsay, Lord, account of the Druses in "Letters on Egypt, Edom and the Holy Land," in 1836, 2, 224.
Louis, St., Letter to the Patriarch and Bishops of Maronites, in which he promises on the part of himself and successors on the throne of France, to afford them equal protection with French subjects, 2, 155.
Lyde, Rev. Samuel, his testimony as to the origin and religion of the Ansayrii, 2, 207.

MacFarlane, interview with the Druse Emir Bechir in 1847, 2, 222.
Machiavelli, his opinion of the Turkish empire 1, 13.
Mahmoud, Sultan of Ghazneh, his wars and conquests in Hindostan; career of, commenced in A.D. 997; his "loots" in India, 1, 212; his career of conquest and carnage in India; his spoiling of Hindostan; his "loot" in Lahore, and at Somnauth; the Christian "looters" in

China not to be compared with the Tartar "looters" in Hindostan; Mahmoud's demolition of the great idol in the temple of Sommauth; carries away the sandal wood gates of the temple; the same restored to the Hindoo pagans by Lord Ellenborough; his death "in the fulness of glory;" his magnificent tomb; his dynasty perfidiously assailed and destroyed by a Seljukian Turk, who had sought and obtained shelter in Sogdiana, 1, 230, 238; his death and manifestation of the ruling passion of his breast for war and rapine in the dying moments; end of a Tartar prince who was always prosperous, 1, 234.

Mahmoud II., Sultan, his career; attempted reforms; opposition at the hands of the Janissaries; his wars with Russia, Greece, the Wahabis, 1, 370, 379; author's recollection of his personal appearance; particulars of a Djereed tournament in Constantinople in 1824, 1, 424; his attempted reforms; the Janissary institution "reformed" altogether; massacre of the Janissaries in June, 1826, 1, 421, 428; loss of his fleet at Navarino in Oct., 1827; disastrous war with Russia, 1828-29; war with Egypt, 1839; observations on his career; his death 2nd July, 1839, 1, 430, 439; his tomb, 1, 440.

Maracci, his translation of, and commentaries on the Koran, 1, 39.

Maron, Saint, presumed patron of the Maronites, 2, 153.

Maronites, notice of, 2, 14; Ubicini's estimate of the population throughout Syria, 2, 161; uncertainty as to founder; protected by the French nation; early relation between them and the French; clergy, number of; convents, doctrines and numbers; hospitality, honesty, and industrious habits; number slain in late massacres, 8,000, 2, 153, 161; notice of their community in Syria, 2, 153, &c.; strenuous and persistent efforts in Press and Parliament to inculpate them and to vindicate the Druses 2, 353.

Massacres of Christians in Mosul, Blanqui's account of, 2, 278; in Bulgaria, Blanqui's account of, 2, 280; by the Druses of the Christians of Melen, 2, 291; at Damascus, by Druses, 2, 294, at Beteddin, 2, 300; at Deir-el-Kammar, 2, 301, 305; in Syria, in 1860, Mr. Graham's detailed report on, to Lord Dufferin, 2, 313, 326; authentic account of, by Mr. Wetzlern, 2, 327; in Damascus, detailed account, 2, 327, 332; further account of ditto, 2, 23, 33; protocol of conference, and articles of agreement of France, England, Austria, Prussia, and Rusia, in August, 1860, 2, 338; destruction of villages, estimate of, 2, 348; proceedings of Consuls in relation to, 2, 349; debates on, in parliament, 2, 355, 358, 359; Colonel Churchill's letter on, 2, 361; the law of Islam at the root of all the guilt, 2, 366; detailed account of their origin, progress, and full accomplishment in 1860, 2, 281, 368.

Massacres, Turkish, of Christian Rayahs; the Turkish panics, a usual occurrence, 1, 293, 297; Rayahs either executed or meditated, on religious grounds, at various epochs, 1, 293, 304.

Maundrell, his account of Turkish fanaticism in 1697, 2, 274.

Mechitar, an Armenian priest, efforts to reclaim his schismatic brethren; founded a religious order with the object of uniting the churches of the East to the Latin Church; death in 1749, 2, 137, 138, 140.

Metoualis, followers of; Aly, son-in-law of Mohammed; notice of, 2, 15; notice of, 2, 237; Dr. Thompson's account of, 2, 238; notice of the sect, 2, 241, 247.

Meteora, ruined monasteries of, perched on peaks of mountains and precipitous rocks, 2, 82.

Michon Abbé; observations relative to manners and customs of Armenian community, 2, 122, 124; expedition to the East in 1850, to reconcile the Greek and Latin Churches; his memorial to Pius IX, 2, 87, 90.

Missionaries (Roman Catholic and Protestant) rivalries and contentions of; Van de Velde's reference to their labours in 1851 and 1852; novel method of converting Christians and Jews of Syria to "true Christianity," by colporteurs, 2, 32, 33.

Mohammed, the pseudo prophet; notice of his career and religious principles, 1, 25; his raptures; visions in the cave of Hira; attacks of syncope; epileptic seizures, 1, 26; in his 40th year, commenced his mission of an apostle, 1, 27; utterly illiterate composition of the Koran; result of assistance of a Latin monk and of schismatic Jews and Christians, 1, 31; had no honour in his own country as an apostle for several years; in four years of his mission had only thirty-nine followers, 1, 33; in the 12th year of his mission, his miraculous night journey to heaven took place, 1, 33; orders his followers to pray with their faces towards Jerusalem; then ordered they should pray with their faces to Mecca and the Kebla, 1, 45; at the battle of Obud, wounded and worsted, 1, 46; from the year 623 A.D., continually engages in wars to extend his religion, 1, 46; by an alleged divine revelation, put his male prisoners to the sword, and made their wives and children captives, 1, 47; assumes the dignity of a prince and a pontiff, 1, 48; his alleged miracles, 1, 40; his wives, 1, 41; his flight from Mecca to Medina in 622 A.D; date of the Hegira, 1, 43; after his arrival in Modena, having acquired power at the expiration of thirteen years, changed the mode of propagating his religion from preaching to fighting, 1, 43; His first war; an attack on a caravan for the sake of plunder, in 622 A.D., 1, 44; his second attack on a caravan for sake of plunder, in 623, 1, 45; had poison administered to him at Chaibar, 1, 49; his belief in magic; said to have been bewitched by the Jews, 1, 50; in 629 A.D., captured Mecca; put to death many of the inhabitants; purged the Caaba of its idols, 1, 50; his death in Medina, 632 A.D., in his 62nd year, from the effects of the poison given to him by Chaibar; in his delirium, wished to dictate another book of revelations, but Omar would not suffer him, 1, 52; his followers quarrelled over his dead body; he had married no less than sixteen wives, 1, 53; his quarrel with his wives, 1, 55; his predominant passions, lust, and ambition, 1, 55; oral revelations of; traditions of the Sonna of heaven and hell, 1, 111, 115.

Mohammed 2nd, Sultan; capture of Constantinople; notice of his career, 1, 290; his violation of a capitulation entered into with the last king of the Bosnians; puts to death the king and his two sons, 1, 300.

Mohammed Ali, of Egypt, notice of his wars and conquests in Syria, and of his system of government there, 2, 43, 50; invasion of Syria in 1831, 2, 44, 45.
Mohammedanism; the realization of the principles of the Koran; a regime of blood and fanaticism, 1, 151; evil influence of on all government, civil and religious, 2, 407. Numbers of its followers throughout the world, 2, appendix.
Mokanna, the first to introduce into Islamism the doctrine of transmigration of souls, 2, 169.
Moldavia and Wallachia, union of and constitutional government declared by treaty of Paris, 1856, 2, 264, population of, 2, 265.
Monks and monasteries of the Greek Church, 2, 80, 84.
Montefiore, Sir Moses, originator of Relief Committee in aid of Syrian Christians, 2, 437.
Montenegro; administration of government; its own prince; population of, 2, 265.
Mouravieff, M., historian of the Russian Orthodox Greek Church, 2, 55.
Mustapha IV., Sultan; succeeds Selim III.; owed his elevation to the Janissaries; deposed and subsequently put to death by the orders of his successor, Mahmoud the 2nd, 1, 370, 372.

Napoleon, the Great, his views in regard to Turkey in 1807; his proposal to the Emperor Alexander to dismember Turkey, 1, 373.
Napoleon recognizes claims of Maronites to French protection, 2, 159.
Navarino, battle of; Panic at Constantinople; destruction of Turkish fleet; wild denunciation of the whole Christian community, 2, 143.
Nersus, Archbishop of Georgia, banished by Russian Government; called in 1843, by the Armenian Church to patriarchal see of Ecmiazin, 2, 135.
Nestorian church, doctrines of, 2, 53.
Newman, Dr., views of Turkish empire, 1, 21; opinion of the dire results of Turkish rule, 2, 406.
Nicholas, Emperor of Russia, his "pet project" of annexation of Turkey to his empire, 2, 257.

Omar Ebu Al Khattab, second Caliph; his war against the Persians in Irak; signal defeat of the Persians at Cadisea; fate of the Persian Empire sealed, A.D. 635; immense spoils taken by the Saracens; Omar's wars and victories in Syria; Jerusalem taken; terms of capitulation; all the principal towns and cities in Syria taken; invaded and subdued Egypt; orders the Alxandrian library to be burned; assassinated in 643, A.D., 1. 133, 147.
Ommiades, dynasty of; commencement with Caliph Moawiyah; death of this caliph; the first great schisms in Islamism began in the time of the Ommiades, the middle of the 7th century, with the contests for the union of temporal and sacerdotal office; the duration of the dynasty of the Ommiades was for about a century, till the middle of the 8th century: the innumerable sects that sprung up in this period productive of incessant strife, massacres and assassinations; in this state of things the secret order of the Assassins had its origin; notice of it, 1, 194, 204.
Orchan, 2nd Sultan of the Turks; first notice of the Turkish Sultans; fratricidal policy of, 1, 248, 269; the Janissary institution, origin of, 249; marries the daughter of the Greek Emperor Cantacuzene; establishes the Turkish capital at Brusa; foments civil war in Constantinople; invades the dominions of the Greek Emperor on the European side of the Bosphorus; takes possession of Gallipoli; plants several Turkish colonies in Thrace; his death in 1359 A.D.; lamentable state of Christendom at that period, 1, 248, 254.
Othman, the founder of the Turkish Empire, first sovereign of the Oguzian-sept of the Ottoman dominions; his immediate ancestors, 1, 239 245.
Othman, Third Caliph, extends former conquest in Persia, Syria, and Egypt; Persian government entirely destroyed 651 A.D.; Othman, assassinated 655 A.D., 1, 148, 154.
Ovaghian, execution of in 1843, by the Turkish Governorfor returning to his own Christian faith from Islamism.

Palestine, its physical geography, 2, 8, 9,; in ancient times; its population 2, 3; its ancient history, 2, 215.
Palmerston's, Lord, views of the regeneraton of Turkey, 1, 15.
Peter the Great, begins to meddle in spiritual affairs of his empire, 1700; displaces the patriarch, forms a Synod, 1721, 2, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63.
Pilgrims to Mecca; remarkable decrease of numbers; referred to by Burton, 1, 471.
Pitt's views of Turkish Empire, 1, 18.
Pius IX, failure of the steps taken by him at commencement of his pontificate to re-unite Greek and Latin Churches, 2, 90.
Princes Islands, monasteries of; one or two occupied by deposed patriarchs and disgraced friars, 1, 82.
Propaganda, founded in 1622 by Pope Gregory XV.; its proceedings in relation to the schismatic churches in the East; alleged violent acts of interference, 2, 136.
Proselytism, difference between Turkish and Christian systems of, 1, 293.
Protestants in Turkey; small success of Bible Society in making converts, 2, 37.
Persecution of the Armenians for frequenting Protestant churches. 2, 38. 39.
Protestantism, its unsuccessful missionary efforts in the Turkish Empire; Sale's sentiments on ditto; rivalries and contentions of Roman Catholic and Protestant missionaries, 2, 30, 36; prospects of Protestantism in Turkey, 2, 37, 42.
Protestant missions in Syria, effects of, 2, 209.

Rashideddin Abulhasher, his imposture; considered by oriental historians as the chief of the Ismailitic doctrine in Syria, 2, 183, 184.
Reasons of state; pleas for perfidy, and pretexts for acts of infamy and injustice; observations on, 1, 375.
Religion by law established; the interests of more power powerful than those of the state, 1, 71.
Reschid Pachas; panacea for evils of Turkish rule, 1, 16.
Rhigas of Thessaly, the Greek poet, patriot, and martyr; notice of his career, 2, 258, 262.
Robertson the historian, his opinion of evil results of Turkish rule, 2, 406.

Rockneddin, the last Grand Master of the Order of the Assassins, 2, 186.
Bousseau Pere, his account of the principal Syrian massacres, 2, 307.
Russian policy in regard to Turkey from the time of Peter the Great and the Empress Catherine, 1, 353, 356; ditto in the time of the Emperor Alexander in 1804, 1805, and 1807, 1, 362, 368; war with Turkey from 1808 to 1812, 1, 358, 363, 376; treaty of peace with Turkey entered into at Adrianople in 1829, 1, 423; the recent war, with its causes and results; Sir H. Seymour's correspondence; conversations with the Czar, Nicholas, about "the sick man," 1, 474, 483; views of the Emperor Nicholas; official correspondence respecting Turkey in the spring of 1853; controversies respecting the custody of the Holy Place, from 1830 to the 11th November, 1853; declared war against Turkey, 1, 481, 502; alliance of France and England, and declaration of war against Russia, 1, 513; expenditure of men and money in the Crimean war, 1, 8, 513; notice of the Orthodox Greek, 2, 55; influence of, over the great mass of the Christian population of Turkish Empire; exercise and results of, at various periods, 2, 248, 258; its views as to dismemberment of Turkish Empire, 2, 411.

Sandy's opinion of its iniquitous government, 1, 14,
Sandy's, Maundrell's &c., travellers in Turkey, the best authorities, 1, 2.
Sale, his views relative to the conversion of the Moslems by Protestants, 2, 30.
Saracens, origin, religion, conversion from Sabianism to Mohammedanism; leading characteristics distinguished from Turks intellectually and morally, 1, 116 127; their astonishing progress from epoch of Hegira (A.D. 632) to death of Omar in 643 A.D., 1, 141, 147; everywhere perfidiously turned on by the Turkish hordes; received into the different provinces were they were generously allowed to settle or were employed as auxiliary forces; their rebellion against their benefactors in Sogdiana, Bagdad, and Damascus; their murders of Caliphs, &c., 1, 210, 212.
Schauffler, Rev. W. G., estimate of number of Greeks in Turkish empire, 2, 66.
Schiites, heterodox sect of Islamism, 1, 196.
Seljuk, a Turcoman chief, grandfather of Toghrul Bey, notice of, 1, 236.
Servia placed under government of its own prince elected in 1850; its population, 2, 265.
Servitude long continued; its debasing and degrading influences exemplified in the usual vices of all enslaved people in the case of the Greeks, 2, 257.
Seveners or Ismailites, the most predominant of the Mohammedan sects; origin of their power 2, 171.
Sheik Bechir, a Druse chief; in 1827 when the author visited Syria his jurisdiction extended over all Mount Lebanon; deprived of his government and banished in 1846, 2, 217, 219; his statement in 1847 to Macfarlane of his betrayal by the British and consequent ruin, 2, 223.
Selim III., Sultan, his career; attempted reform; opposition at the hands of the Janissaries; conspiracy against Selim; his deposition and subsequent murder by order of his successor Mustapha, 1, 353, 369.
Sextus V., efforts to effect a reconciliation with the schismatic churches of the east, 1587, 2, 137.
Sinope, battle of in Nov. 1853, 1, 502.
Skene, Consul, opinion of dire results of Turkish rule, 2, 403.
Slaves, Christian; Turkish slave market for sale of Christian slaves in Constantinople in virtue of an infamous treaty of Orchan, Turkish sovereign, with the Greek Emperor; Sultan Amurath's claim to fifth part of all spoil taken in wars with Christians, 1, 261.
Sonnites, orthodox sect of Islamism account of, 1, 195.
Solyman, the Seljuikan Tartar Turcoman chief driven from his country seeks a refuge in Roumania; takes up his abode in Amasia; makes continual wars on the Christians of that region; had to fly to Syria, purposing to return with his tribe to Tartary, and trying to cross the Euphrates, perished in that river; 1, 240, 241.
Solyman Schah, the Turkoman chief who perished in the Euphrates, left four sons, one of whom Ertogrul was the father of Othman, the founder of the Ottoman empire, 1, 242, 245.
Smyrna to Constantinople, journey of the author in 1824, through an uucultivated country, of 300 miles extent, 1, 19.
Stanley, Rev. A. N., his observations relative to physical geography of Syria, 2, 8.
Synod of Russian Church, instituted by Peter the Great; its original composition; Mouravieff's observations relative to its dependence on the Czar, 2, 61, 63.
Syria, its divisions, sects, and races, 2, 1, 2, 3, 4; language of different races.
Syrian massacres of 1860, an extensive notice of from beginning to end, 2, 267.
Syrian Christians, various plans for government of the Lebanon, 2, 362.

Tartar Race; origin of the Turcoman tribes; the Seljukian Turks; the founders of the Ottoman Empire; notice of ancient Tartary; the Scythian hordes; the three highways of their migrations; southward and westward into Europe across the Danube; the Oxus and the Caucasus, 1, 205, 238; wars and conquests of Attila, Zinghis, Khan, and Timour; the hordes of Huns, Goths, Scythians, constituting the Tartar power; the old store-house of nations; its fearful provision of havoc and devastation impending on all ancient civilization, 1, 217, 229.
Theodore, Czar, causes creation of a distinct and independent patriarchate of Greek Church in Russia, 1587, 2, 59.
Thompson, Dr, estimate of numbers of different Syrian races and sects, 2, 16, 17.
Thornton, Mr., opinion of evil results of Turkish rule, 2, 406.
Timour, his wars, conquests, and massacres; at Delhi; his slaughter of 100,000 prisoners; his impost on Ispahan of 70,000 human heads to build towers with; similar tax levied at Bagdad of 90,000 skulls; Timour, like Zinghis, Khan, and Attila, "died in the fullness of glory," prosperous in all their great murderous undertakings; his achievements against the Ottomans, 1, 227, 244; his career of war and conquest in the Turkish Empire; his defeat and capture of the Sultan Bajazet; con-

finement of his captive in an iron cage, 1, 278; brief notice of his conquests in various regions of the globe; his lust of dominion; passion for annexing kingdoms; his massacres; his death; observations on his character and career, 1, 278, 288.
Togrul Beg, a Turcoman chief, his wars and conquests in the Greek provinces in Asia Minor, 1, 236.
Turkish Empire; our last war for its maintenance; cost of life and treasure from official returns, 1, 8,513; its Christian eulogists, 1, 17; Pitt's views of the necessity of sustaining it, 1, 18; true interest of England in relation to, 1, 19; Turks distinguished from Saracens, intellectually and morally, 1, 119, 120, the Turcoman tribes of; notices of, 1, 209, 219; perfidy of its people, a characteristic of theirs at all periods of their history; against the Saracens, the Persians, the Caliphs of Bagdad, Damascus; the Dynasty of Soldan; Mahmoud in Sogdiana, 1, 235, 236; barbarous fratricidal policy of Turkish sovereigns, 1, 248, 269, 298; the leading and distinguishing characteristics of the nation and the individual; abhorrence of Christianity, and an insatiable thirst for the blood of Christians, 1, 256; sympathy of the old English historical writers, such as Knolles, with down-trodden Christianity, and the sufferings of Christians at the hands of the Turks, to be sought for in vain in the pages of our modern historical writers, 1, 258; its institutions connected with the religion and the law of Islam; notice of origin and attributes of the several offices of the Sheik-ul-Islam, the Mufti, the Ulemas, the Imaums, Kayims, the Muezzims, legal officers, the Mollahs, the Cadis, the Nahibs, the Katibs, 1, 306, 318; proposal of government to British ambassador to obtain a loan and mortgage the revenues of the mosques, as security for re-payment of loan, 1, 375; newspaper press in the Ottoman Empire, notice of, 1, 435; the reform doctrine of Sultan Mahmoud the 2nd, supposed to have shaken the faith of vast numbers of his people, and to have led to infidelity more formidable even than fanaticism, 1, 437; the projected reforms, practical failures, 1, 438; the connexion of the state with the church, and the impediments of that connexion to all efforts at reform, involving toleration and religious liberty, 1, 459; fanaticism inculcated in all its schools and mosques, 1, 460; its hierarchs; the Sheik-ul-Islam, Mufti, and Ulemas, opposed to all reforms, 1, 463; vain efforts to reform its institutions and lamentable effects of Turkish rule; depopulation and abandonment of cultivation in the finest regions of the globe, 1, 465, 473; author's experience of the fact in a land journey from Smyrna to Constantinople, 1, 465; inevitable downfall of, 1, 472; fanaticism of its people in 1853; the Sultan compelled by it to declare war against Russia, 1, 498, 502, 504, 507; expenditure incurred by England for its maintenance in the Crimean war; total loss of life sustained by the English in that war, 1, 8, 512, 513, 514; statistics of population, races, creeds, finances, resources, expenditure, loans, 1, 515, 543; observations on financial embarrassments of, and inevitable ruin of them, which must lead to dissolution of Turkish Empire, 1, 543, 546; finances of, the state of, in the last year of the reign of Sultan Abdul Medjid; enormous expenditure on palaces, harems; prevalent corruption in every department of the state; ruinous expedient to obtain ready money, mortgaging of revenues indispensable for ordinary expenditure of government, to pay interest on foreign loans; dissolution of the Turkish Empire an impossibility to avert, 1, 532, 544; civilization, no evidences of, in the uncultivated soil of European Turkey, Asia Minor, Syria, &c., 1, 20, 21, 23, 466; policy of, in the East, the setting of one Rayah faction against another; dividing and governing embroiled Christian sects, and arraying one race against another, imitated in some Christian countries, 2, 274; its rule in the East; barbarities of, described by Walpole, 2, 275; the normal state of, one of insolvency, and permanent inability to defray expenditure of government, 2, 520; its revenue, expenditure, and public debt, in 1861, 2, 555; rule, dire results of, 2, 403; maintenance of, and perpetuation of, the dire results of its results, ascribed, by a recent writer, to Great Britain, 2, 410; ruinous results of its rule in the East, described by Count Gurowski, 2, 411; impending doom of; opinion of, Dr. Newman, 2, 415.
Tyre and Sidon, notice of; author's recollection of, 2, 467.

Ubicini, M., errors in his "Letters sur la Turquie," relative to Roman Catholic population of Turkish Empire, 2, 17, 18.

Wahabis, the Turkish and Egyptian war against notice of, 1, 379.
Walpole, Hon. F., his account of Turkish fanaticism, 2, 275; his account of the Ansayrii in "Travels in the East," 2, 197.
Warriors, Great, the Tartarean region assigned for their manes in another world; happy meeting of the ghosts of Sesostrius, Cyrus, Cambyses, Alexander, Cæsar, Attilla, Kinghez Khan, Timour, Mahmoud of Gazneh, Cromwell and Bonaparte on the shores of Tartarus, 1, 235; Views of Poggius, the Florentine, of their titles to glory and of their heroism bordering on the domain of insanity, 4, 288.
Wilberforce, Mr., observations relative to movement of the Bulgarians for a re-union with Church of Rome, and wish of certain Turkish provinces to inoculate their nationalities with the French spirit; historical traditions relative to cause of this movement, 2, 22, 23, 24, 25.

Velde, Van de, his account of Protestant missionary labours in Syria, 2, 33, 34, 35.
Vladmir, Prince, the first Russian prince who joined the orthodox Greek Church; circumstance which led to this event, and origin of Christianity in Russia, 2, 57.
Vogue, De Comte, his account of the Syrian massacres in 1860, 2, 287.